





906 A51 1921 v.1

# Kansas City Public Library



This Volume is for  
REFERENCE USE ONLY





**ANNUAL REPORT**  
**OF THE**  
**AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION**  
**FOR**  
**THE YEAR 1921**

**IN ONE VOLUME**  
**AND A SUPPLEMENTAL VOLUME**



**WASHINGTON**  
**GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE**  
**1926**

ADDITIONAL COPIES  
OF THIS PUBLICATION MAY BE PROCURED FROM  
THE SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
WASHINGTON, D. C.

AT  
40 CENTS PER COPY

906

A51

1921 v.1.

Reference

## LETTER OF SUBMITTAL

MAY 24, 1924.

*To the Congress of the United States:*

In accordance with the act of incorporation of the American Historical Association approved January 4, 1889, I have the honor to submit to Congress the annual report of the association for the year 1921. I have the honor to be,

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

CHARLES D. WALCOTT, *Secretary.*

## ACT OF INCORPORATION

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That Andrew D. White, of Ithaca, in the State of New York; George Bancroft, of Washington, in the District of Columbia; Justin Winsor, of Cambridge, in the State of Massachusetts; William F. Poole, of Chicago, in the State of Illinois; Herbert B. Adams, of Baltimore, in the State of Maryland; Clarence W. Bowen, of Brooklyn, in the State of New York, their associates and successors, are hereby created, in the District of Columbia, a body corporate and politic by the name of the American Historical Association, for the promotion of historical studies, the collection and preservation of historical manuscripts, and for kindred purposes in the interest of American history and of history in America. Said association is authorized to hold real and personal estate in the District of Columbia so far only as may be necessary to its lawful ends to an amount not exceeding \$500,000, to adopt a constitution, and make by-laws not inconsistent with law. Said association shall have its principal office at Washington, in the District of Columbia, and may hold its annual meetings in such places as the said incorporators shall determine. Said association shall report annually to the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution concerning its proceedings and the condition of historical study in America. Said secretary shall communicate to Congress the whole of such report, or such portions thereof as he shall see fit. The Regents of the Smithsonian Institution are authorized to permit said association to deposit its collections, manuscripts, books, pamphlets, and other material for history in the Smithsonian Institution or in the National Museum at their discretion, upon such conditions and under such rules as they shall prescribe.

[Approved, January 4, 1889.]

## LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

JUNE 30, 1922.

SIR: We submit herewith, as provided by law, the Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the year 1921.

The report includes the proceedings of the association for the thirty-sixth annual meeting at St. Louis on December 27-30, 1921, together with the proceedings of the Pacific Coast Branch of the American Historical Association at its sixteenth annual meeting at Portland, Oregon, November 25-26, 1921.

In order to keep the contents of the annual reports within a compass that will permit the publication of more than a single report in a year and so gradually bring the reports to date, abstracts of the papers read at the meeting at St. Louis and not the papers in full appear in the report for 1921. This is in accordance with a resolution adopted by the executive council of the association at its meeting on December —, 1920.

A bibliography of books and articles on United States and Canadian history published during the year 1921, with some memoranda on other portions of America, compiled by Grace Gardiner Griffin, is presented for publication as a supplemental volume to this report, under the general title "Writings on American History, 1921."

Very respectfully,

H. BARRETT LEARNED,

*Chairman of the Committee on Publications.*

ALLEN R. BOYD, *Editor.*

To the SECRETARY OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION,

*Washington, D. C.*



## CONTENTS

	Page
I. Proceedings of the thirty-sixth annual meeting of the American Historical Association .....	27
II. Proceedings of the seventeenth annual meeting of the Pacific Coast Branch of the American Historical Association.....	95
III. Proceedings of the seventeenth annual conference of historical societies .....	107
IV. Conference of Archivists.....	121
Conference on the teaching of history in schools.....	121
V. Problems of economic history.....	125
VI. Ancient history .....	139
VII. Medieval history.....	145
VIII. Conference on English history.....	154
General session on the history of France.....	156
IX. Modern European history: Europe after the Congress of Vienna..	159
X. Conference on the history of the Far East.....	169
Conference on the Hispanic-American history.....	170
XI. American history .....	175
XII. Agricultural history.....	217
XIII. The history of civilization.....	227
XIV. The history of science.....	239

### SUPPLEMENTAL VOLUME.

Writings on American history, 1919, compiled by Grace Gardner Griffin.



# CONSTITUTION

## I

The name of this society shall be The American Historical Association.

## II

Its object shall be the promotion of historical studies.

## III

Any person approved by the executive council may become a member by paying \$5, and after the first year may continue a member by paying an annual fee of \$5. On payment of \$100 any person may become a life member, exempt from fees. Persons not resident in the United States may be elected as honorary or corresponding members and be exempt from the payment of fees.

## IV

The officers shall be a president, two vice presidents, a secretary, a treasurer, an assistant secretary-treasurer, and an editor.

The president, vice presidents, secretary, and treasurer shall be elected by ballot at each regular annual meeting in the manner provided in the by-laws.

The assistant secretary-treasurer and the editor shall be elected by the executive council. They shall perform such duties and receive such compensation as the council may determine.

## V

There shall be an executive council, constituted as follows:

1. The president, the vice presidents, the secretary, and the treasurer.
2. Elected members, eight in number, to be chosen annually in the same manner as the officers of the association.
3. The former presidents; but a former president shall be entitled to vote for the three years succeeding the expiration of his term as president, and no longer.

## VI

The executive council shall conduct the business, manage the property, and care for the general interests of the association. In the exercise of its proper functions, the council may appoint such committees, commissions, and boards as it may deem necessary. The council shall make a full report of its activities to the annual meeting of the association. The association may by vote at any annual meeting instruct the executive council to discontinue or enter upon any activity, and may take such other action in directing the affairs of the association as it may deem necessary and proper.

## VII

This constitution may be amended at any annual meeting, notice of such amendment having been given at the previous annual meeting or the proposed amendment having received the approval of the executive council.

## BY-LAWS

### I

The officers provided for by the constitution shall have the duties and perform the functions customarily attached to their respective offices with such others as may from time to time be prescribed.

### II

A nomination committee of five members shall be chosen at each annual business meeting in the manner hereafter provided for the election of officers of the association. At such convenient time prior to the 15th of September as it may determine, it shall invite every member to express to it his preference regarding every office to be filled by election at the ensuing annual business meeting and regarding the composition of the new nominating committee then to be chosen. It shall publish and mail to each member at least one month prior to the annual business meeting such nominations as it may determine upon for each elective office and for the next nominating committee. It shall prepare for use at the annual business meeting an official ballot containing, as candidates for each office or committee membership to be filled thereat, the names of its nominees and also the names of any other nominees which may be proposed to the chairman of the committee in writing by 20 or more members of the association at least one day before the annual business meeting, but such nominations by petition shall not be presented until after the committee shall have reported its nominations to the association, as provided for in the present by-law. The official ballot shall also provide under each office a blank space for voting for such further nominees as any member may present from the floor at the time of the election.

### III

The annual election of officers and the choice of a nominating committee for the ensuing year shall be conducted by the use of an official ballot prepared as described in By-law II.

### IV

The association authorizes the payment of traveling expenses incurred by the voting members of the council attending one meeting of that body a year, this meeting to be other than that held in connection with the annual meeting of the association.

The council may provide for the payment of expenses incurred by the secretary, the assistant secretary-treasurer, and the editor in such travel as may be necessary to the transaction of the association's business.

## AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

Organized at Saratoga, N. Y., September 10, 1884. Incorporated by Congress  
January 4, 1889

### OFFICERS ELECTED DECEMBER 30, 1921

#### PRESIDENT :

CHARLES H. HASKINS, PH. D.,  
*Harvard University.*

#### VICE PRESIDENTS :

EDWARD P. CHEYNEY, A. M., LL. D.,  
*University of Pennsylvania.*

WOODROW WILSON, LL. D., LITT. D.,  
*Washington, D. C.*

#### SECRETARY :

JOHN SPENCER BASSETT, PH. D.,  
*Smith College.*

#### TREASURER :

CHARLES MOORE, PH. D.,  
*Library of Congress.*

#### EXECUTIVE COUNCIL :

(In addition to the above-named officers)  
(Ex-presidents)

JAMES FORD RHODES, LL. D., D. LITT.,  
*Boston, Mass.*

JOHN BACH McMASTER, A. M., PH. D., LITT. D., LL. D.,  
*University of Pennsylvania.*

SIMEON E. BALDWIN, LL. D.,  
*New Haven, Conn.*

JOHN FRANKLIN JAMESON, PH. D., LL. D., LITT. D.,  
*Carnegie Institution of Washington.*

GEORGE BURTON ADAMS, PH. D., LITT. D.,  
*Yale University.*

ALBERT BUSHNELL HART, PH. D., LL. D., LITT. D.,  
*Harvard University.*

FREDERICK JACKSON TURNER, PH. D., LL. D., LITT. D.,  
*Harvard University.*

WILLIAM MILLIGAN SLOANE, PH. D., L. H. D., LL. D.,  
*Columbia University.*

WILLIAM ARCHIBALD DUNNING, PH. D., LL. D.,  
*Columbia University.*

ANDREW C. McLAUGHLIN, A. M., LL. B., LL. D.,  
*University of Chicago.*

GEORGE LINCOLN BURR, LL. D., LITT. D.,  
*Cornell University.*

WORTHINGTON C. FORD, A. M.,  
*Massachusetts Historical Society.*

WILLIAM ROSCOE THAYER, LL. D., LITT. D., L. H. D.,  
*Cambridge.*

EDWARD CHANNING, PH. D.,  
*Harvard University.*

JEAN JULES JUSSERAND, F. B. A.,  
*French Embassy.*

(Elected Councilors.)

JAMES T. SHOTWELL, PH. D.,  
*Columbia University.*

RUTH PUTNAM, B. LITT.,  
*Washington.*

ARTHUR L. CROSS, PH. D.,  
*University of Michigan.*

SIDNEY B. FAY, PH. D.,  
*Smith College.*

CARL RUSSELL FISH, PH. D.,  
*University of Wisconsin.*

CARLTON J. H. HAYES, PH. D.,  
*Columbia University.*

FREDERIC L. PAXSON, PH. D.,  
*University of Wisconsin.*

ST. GEORGE L. SIOUSSAT, PH. D.,  
*University of Pennsylvania.*

main  
8  
1  
8  
0  
7  
1  
8  
1  
9  
2  
1  
5  
4  
A  
0  
6

PACIFIC COAST BRANCH  
AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

---

OFFICERS ELECTED NOVEMBER 25, 1921

PRESIDENT :

PAYSON J. TREAT, PH. D.,  
*Stanford University.*

VICE PRESIDENT :

EUGENE I. McCORMAC, PH. D.,  
*University of California.*

SECRETARY-TREASURER :

WILLIAM A. MORRIS, PH. D.,  
*University of California.*

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL :

(In addition to the above-named officers)

ROBERT G. CLELAND, PH. D.,  
*Occidental College.*

CRYSTAL HARFORD, L. B.,  
*University High School, Oakland, Calif.*

HENRY S. LUCAS,  
*University of Washington.*

OLIVE KUNTZ, PH. D.,  
*Reed College.*

## TERMS OF OFFICE

(Deceased officers are marked thus: †)

### EX-PRESIDENTS

†ANDREW DICKSON WHITE, L. H. D., LL. D., D. C. L., 1884-1885.  
 †GEORGE BANCROFT, LL. D., 1885-1886.  
 †JUSTIN WINSOR, LL. D., 1886-1887.  
 †WILLIAM FREDERICK POOLE, LL. D., 1887-1888.  
 †CHARLES KENDALL ADAMS, LL. D., 1888-1889.  
 †JOHN JAY, LL. D., 1889-1890.  
 †WILLIAM WIRT HENRY, LL. D., 1890-1891.  
 †JAMES BURRILL ANGELL, LL. D., 1891-1893.  
 †HENRY ADAMS, LL. D., 1893-1894.  
 †GEORGE FRISBIE HOAR, LL. D., 1895.  
 †RICHARD SALTER STORRS, D. D., LL. D., 1896.  
 †JAMES SCHOUER, LL. D., 1897.  
 †GEORGE PARK FISHER, D. D., LL. D., 1898.  
 JAMES FORD RHODES, LL. D., D. Litt., 1899.  
 †EDWARD EGGLESTON, L. H. D., 1900.  
 †CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, LL. D., 1901.  
 †ALFRED THAYER MAHAN, D. C. L., LL. D., 1902.  
 †HENRY CHARLES LEA, LL. D., 1903.  
 †GOLDWIN SMITH, D. C. L., LL. D., 1904.  
 JOHN BACH McMASTER, Ph. D., Litt. D., LL. D., 1905.  
 SIMEON E. BALDWIN, LL. D., 1906.  
 J. FRANKLIN JAMESON, Ph. D., LL. D., Litt. D., 1907.  
 GEORGE BURTON ADAMS, Ph. D., Litt. D., 1908.  
 ALBERT BUSHNEILL HART, Ph. D., LL. D., Litt. D., 1909.  
 FREDERICK JACKSON TURNER, Ph. D., LL. D., Litt. D., 1910.  
 WILLIAM MILLIGAN SLOANE, Ph. D., L. H. D., LL. D., 1911.  
 †THEODORE ROOSEVELT, LL. D., D. C. L., 1912.  
 WILLIAM ARCHIBALD DUNNING, Ph. D., LL. D., 1913.  
 ANDREW C. McLAUGHLIN, A. M., LL. B., LL. D., 1914.  
 †H. MORSE STEPHENS, M. A., Litt. D., 1915.  
 GEORGE LINCOLN BURR, LL. D., Litt. D., 1916.  
 WORTHINGTON C. FORD, A. M., 1917.  
 WILLIAM ROSCOE THAYER, LL. D., Litt. D., L. H. D., 1918-1919.  
 EDWARD CHANNING, Ph. D., 1920.  
 JEAN JULES JUSSERAND, F. B. A., 1921.

### EX-VICE PRESIDENTS

†JUSTIN WINSOR, LL. D., 1884-1886.  
 †CHARLES KENDALL ADAMS, LL. D., 1886-1888.  
 †WILLIAM FREDERICK POOLE, LL. D., 1886-1887.  
 †JOHN JAY, LL. D., 1887-1889.  
 †WILLIAM WIRT HENRY, LL. D., 1888-1890.  
 †JAMES BURRILL ANGELL, LL. D., 1889-1891.  
 †HENRY ADAMS, LL. D., 1890-1893.  
 †EDWARD GAY MASON, A. M., 1891-1894.  
 †GEORGE FRISBIE HOAR, LL. D., 1894.  
 †RICHARD SALTER STORRS, D. D., LL. D., 1895.  
 †JAMES SCHOUER, LL. D., 1895, 1896.  
 †GEORGE PARK FISHER, D. D., LL. D., 1896, 1897.  
 JAMES FORD RHODES, LL. D., D. Litt., 1897, 1898.  
 †EDWARD EGGLESTON, L. H. D., 1898, 1899.  
 †MOSES COIT TYLER, L. H. D., LL. D., 1899, 1900.  
 †CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, LL. D., 1900.

†HERBERT BAXTER ADAMS, PH. D., LL. D., 1901.  
 †ALFRED THAYER MAHAN, D. C. L., LL. D., 1901.  
 †HENRY CHARLES LEA, LL. D., 1902.  
 †GOLDWIN SMITH, D. C. L., LL. D., 1902, 1903.  
 †EDWARD MCCRADY, LL. D., 1903.  
 JOHN BACH McMASTER, PH. D., LITT. D., LL. D., 1904.  
 SIMEON E. BALDWIN, LL. D., 1904, 1905.  
 J. FRANKLIN JAMESON, PH. D., LL. D., LITT. D., 1905, 1906.  
 GEORGE BURTON ADAMS, PH. D., LITT. D., 1906, 1907.  
 ALBERT BUSHNELL HART, PH. D., LL. D., LITT. D., 1907, 1908.  
 FREDERICK JACKSON TURNER, PH. D., LL. D., LITT. D., 1908, 1909.  
 WILLIAM MILLIGAN SLOANE, PH. D., L. H. D., LL. D., 1909, 1910.  
 †THEODORE ROOSEVELT, LL. D., D. C. L., 1910, 1911.  
 WILLIAM ARCHIBALD DUNNING, PH. D., LL. D., 1911, 1912.  
 ANDREW C. McLAUGHLIN, A. M., LL. B., LL. D., 1912, 1913.  
 †H. MORSE STEPHENS, M. A., LITT. D., 1913, 1914.  
 GEORGE LINCOLN BURR, LL. D., LITT. D., 1914, 1915.  
 WORTHINGTON C. FORD, A. M., 1915, 1916.  
 WILLIAM ROSCOE THAYER, LL. D., LITT. D., L. H. D., 1916, 1917.  
 EDWARD CHANNING, PH. D., 1917-1919.  
 JEAN JULES JUSSERAND, F. B. A., 1918-1920.  
 CHARLES H. HASKINS, PH. D., 1920, 1921.

## SECRETARIES

†HERBERT BAXTER ADAMS, PH. D., LL. D., 1884-1900.  
 †A. HOWARD CLARK, A. M., 1889-1908.  
 CHARLES HOMER HASKINS, PH. D., 1900-1913.  
 WALDO GIFFORD LELAND, A. M., 1908-1919.  
 EVARTS BOUTELL GREENE, PH. D., 1914-1919.  
 JOHN SPENCER BASSETT, PH. D., 1919-

## TREASURERS

CLARENCE WINTHROP BOWEN, PH. D., 1884-1917.  
 CHARLES MOORE, PH. D., 1917-

## CURATOR

†A. HOWARD CLARK, A. M., 1889-1918.

## EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

†WILLIAM BABCOCK WEEDEN, A. M., 1884-1886.  
 †CHARLES DEANE, LL. D., 1884-1887.  
 †MOSES COIT TYLER, L. H. D., LL. D., 1884-1885.  
 EPHRAIM EMERTON, PH. D., 1884-1885.  
 †FRANKLIN BOWDITCH DEXTER, A. M., LITT. D., 1885-1887.  
 †WILLIAM FRANCIS ALLEN, A. M., 1885-1887.  
 †WILLIAM WIRT HENRY, LL. D., 1886-1888.  
 †RUTHERFORD BIRCHARD HAYES, LL. D., 1887-1888.  
 JOHN W. BURGESS, PH. D., LL. D., 1887-1891.  
 †ARTHUR MARTIN WHEELER, A. M., LL. D., 1887-1889.  
 †GEORGE PARK FISHER, D. D., LL. D., 1888-1891.  
 †GEORGE BROWN GOODE, LL. D., 1889-1896.  
 JOHN GEORGE BOURINOT, C. M. G., D. C. L., LL. D., 1889-1894.  
 JOHN BACH McMASTER, PH. D., LITT. D., LL. D., 1891-1894.  
 GEORGE BURTON ADAMS, PH. D., LITT. D., 1891-1897; 1898-1901.  
 †THEODORE ROOSEVELT, LL. D., D. C. L., 1894-1895.  
 †JABEZ LAMAR MONROE CURRY, LL. D., 1894-1895.  
 †H. MORSE STEPHENS, M. A., LITT. D., 1895-1899.  
 FREDERICK JACKSON TURNER, PH. D., LL. D., LITT. D., 1895-1899; 1901-1904.  
 †EDWARD MINOR GALLAUDET, PH. D., LL. D., 1896-1897.  
 †MELVILLE WESTON FULLER, LL. D., 1897-1900.  
 ALBERT BUSHNELL HART, PH. D., LITT. D., 1897-1900.  
 ANDREW C. McLAUGHLIN, A. M., LL. B., LL. D., 1898-1901; 1903-1906.  
 WILLIAM ARCHIBALD DUNNING, PH. D., LL. D., 1899-1902.

- †PETER WHITE, A. M., 1899-1902.  
 J. FRANKLIN JAMESON, PH. D., LL. D., LITT. D., 1900-1903.  
 A. LAWRENCE LOWELL, PH. D., LL. D., 1900-1903.  
 HERBERT PUTNAM, LITT. D., LL. D., 1901-1904.  
 GEORGE LINCOLN BURR, LL. D., 1902-1905.  
 EDWARD POTTS CHEYNEY, LL. D., 1902-1905.  
 †EDWARD G. BOURNE, PH. D., 1903-1906.  
 †GEORGE P. GARRISON, PH. D., 1904-1907.  
 †REUBEN GOLD THWAITES, LL. D., 1904-1907.  
 CHARLES MCLEAN ANDREWS, PH. D., L. H. D., 1905-1908.  
 JAMES HARVEY ROBINSON, PH. D., 1905-1908.  
 WORTHINGTON CHAUNCEY FORD, A. M., 1906-1909.  
 WILLIAM MACDONALD, PH. D., LL. D., 1906-1909.  
 MAX FARRAND, PH. D., 1907-1910.  
 FRANK HEYWOOD HODDER, PH. M., 1907-1910.  
 EVARTS BOUTELL GREENE, PH. D., 1908-1911.  
 CHARLES HENRY HULL, PH. D., 1908-1911.  
 FRANKLIN LAFAYETTE RILEY, A. M., PH. D., 1909-1912.  
 EDWIN ERLE SPARKS, PH. D., LL. D., 1909-1912.  
 JAMES ALBERT WOODBURN, PH. D., LL. D., 1910-1913.  
 FRED MORROW FLING, PH. D., 1910-1913.  
 HERMAN VANDENBURG AMES, PH. D., 1911-1914.  
 DANA CARLETON MUNRO, A. M., 1911-1914.  
 ARCHIBALD CARY COOLIDGE, PH. D., 1912-1914.  
 JOHN MARTIN VINCENT, PH. D., LL. D., 1912-1915.  
 FREDERIC BANCROFT, PH. D., LL. D., 1913-1915.  
 CHARLES HOMER HASKINS, PH. D., 1913-1916.  
 EUGENE C. BARKER, PH. D., 1914-1917.  
 GUY S. FORD, B. L., PH. D., 1914-1917.  
 ULRICH B. PHILLIPS, PH. D., 1914-1917.  
 LUCY M. SALMON, A. M., L. H. D., 1915-1919.  
 SAMUEL B. HARDING, PH. D., 1915-1919.  
 HENRY E. BOURNE, A. B., B. D., L. H. D., 1916-1920.  
 CHARLES MOORE, PH. D., 1916-1917.  
 GEORGE M. WRONG, M. A., 1916-1920.  
 HERBERT E. BOLTON, B. L., PH. D., 1917-1920.  
 WILLIAM E. DODD, PH. D., 1917-1920.  
 WALTER L. FLEMING, M. S., PH. D., 1917-1920.  
 WILLIAM E. LINGELBACH, PH. D., 1917-1920.  
 JAMES T. SHOTWELL, PH. D., 1919-  
 RUTH PUTNAM, B. LITT., 1919-  
 ARTHUR L. CROSS, PH. D., 1920-  
 SIDNEY B. FAY, PH. D., 1920-  
 CARL RUSSELL FISH, PH. D., 1920-  
 CARLTON J. H. HAYES, PH. D., 1920-  
 FREDERIC L. PAXSON, PH. D., 1920-  
 ST. GEORGE L. SIOUSSAT, PH. D., 1920-

## OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES, 1922

## OFFICERS

*President.*—Charles H. Haskins, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

*First vice president.*—Edward P. Cheyney, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

*Second vice president.*—Woodrow Wilson, Washington, D. C.

*Secretary.*—John S. Bassett, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.

*Treasurer.*—Charles Moore, Library of Congress, Washington, D. C.

*Assistant secretary-treasurer.*—Patty W. Washington, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.

*Editor.*—Allen R. Boyd, Library of Congress, Washington, D. C.

## EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

(In addition to above)

*Elected members.*—Arthur L. Cross, 705 South State Street, Ann Arbor, Mich.; Sidney B. Fay, 32 Paradise Road, Northampton, Mass.; Carl Russell Fish, 244 Lake Lawn Place, Madison, Wis.; Carlton J. H. Hayes, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.; Frederic L. Paxson, 2122 Van Hise Avenue, Madison, Wis.; Ruth Putnam, 2025 O Street NW., Washington, D. C.; James T. Shotwell, 407 West One Hundred and Seventeenth Street, New York, N. Y.; St. George L. Sioussat, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

*Ex-presidents.*—James Ford Rhodes, 392 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass.; John Bach McMaster, 2109 Delancy Place, Philadelphia, Pa.; Simeon E. Baldwin, 69 Church Street, New Haven, Conn.; J. Franklin Jameson, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.; George Burton Adams, 57 Edgehill Road, New Haven, Conn.; Albert Bushnell Hart, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.; Frederick J. Turner, 7 Phillips Place, Cambridge, Mass.; William M. Sloane, Princeton, N. J.; William A. Dunning, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.; Andrew C. McLaughlin, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.; George L. Burr, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.; Worthington C. Ford, 1154 Boylston Street, Boston, Mass.; William Roscoe Thayer, 8 Berkeley Street, Cambridge, Mass.; Edward Channing, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.; Ambassador Jean Jules Jusserand, French Embassy, Washington, D. C.

## STANDING EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL

*Committee on agenda.*—Charles H. Haskins (ex officio), chairman; Edward P. Cheyney (ex officio), Woodrow Wilson (ex officio), John S. Bassett (ex officio), Charles Moore (ex officio), Arthur L. Cross, Sidney B. Fay, Carlton J. H. Hayes, Frederic L. Paxson.

*Committee on meetings and relations.*—John S. Bassett, chairman; Edward Channing, Carl Russell Fish, James T. Shotwell, Ruth Putnam.

*Committee on finance.*—Charles Moore, chairman; John S. Bassett, Sidney B. Fay, Frederic L. Paxson, St. George L. Sioussat.

*Committee on appointments.*—Charles H. Haskins, chairman; John S. Bassett, Edward P. Cheyney, Carl Russell Fish, Carlton J. H. Hayes.

*Committee on nominations.*—Henry E. Bourne, chairman, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio; William E. Dodd, 5757 Blackstone Avenue, Chicago, Ill.; William E. Lingelbach, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.; Nellie Neilson, Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass.; William L. Westermann, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.

*Delegates in American council of Learned Societies.*—J. Franklin Jameson, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C. (term expires 1924); Charles H. Haskins, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (term expires 1925).

## STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE ASSOCIATION

*Committee on program for the thirty-seventh annual meeting.*—David S. Muzzey, chairman, 492 Van Cortlandt Park Avenue, Yonkers, N. Y.; Charles Seymour, 127 Everit Street, New Haven, Conn. (term expires 1922); Walter L. Fleming, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn. (1923); Eloise Ellery, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y. (1924); Wilbur H. Siebert, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio; ex officio, Nils Andreas Olsen, secretary of the Agricultural History Society, Bureau of Farm Management, Department of

Agriculture, Washington, D. C.; John C. Parish, secretary of the Conference of Historical Societies, State Historical Society of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.

*Committee on local arrangements, thirty-seventh annual meeting.*—Max Farland, chairman, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

*Board of editors of the American Historical Review.*—J. Franklin Jameson, managing editor, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C. (term expires 1925); William E. Dodd, 5757 Blackstone Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1927); Guy Stanton Ford, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn. (1926); Archibald C. Coolidge, 4 Randolph Hall, Cambridge, Mass. (1924); Williston Walker, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (1923); Carl Becker, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. (1922).

*Historical manuscripts commission.*—Justin H. Smith, chairman, 7 West Forty-third Street, New York, N. Y.; Annie H. Abel, 811 North M Street, Aberdeen, Wash.; Eugene C. Barker, University of Texas, Austin, Tex.; Robert P. Brooks, University of Georgia, Athens, Ga.; Logan Esarey, Bloomington, Ind.; Gaillard Hunt, Department of State, Washington, D. C.

*Committee on Justin Winsor prize.*—Isaac J. Cox, chairman, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.; C. S. Boucher, University of Texas, Austin, Tex.; Thomas F. Moran, Purdue University, West La Fayette, Ind.; Bernard C. Steiner, Enoch Pratt Free Library, Baltimore, Md.; C. Mildred Thompson, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.

*Committee on the Herbert Baxter Adams prize.*—Conyers Read, chairman, 1218 Snyder Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa.; Charles H. McIlwain, 19 Francis Avenue, Cambridge, Mass.; Nellie Neilson, Mt. Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass.; Louis J. Paetow, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.; Bernadotte E. Schmitt, 1938 East One hundred and sixteenth Street, Cleveland, Ohio; Wilbur H. Siebert, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

*Committee on publications* (all ex officio except the chairman).—H. Barrett Learned, chairman, 2123 Bancroft Place, Washington, D. C.; Allen R. Boyd, secretary, Library of Congress, Washington, D. C.; John S. Bassett, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.; J. Franklin Jameson, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.; Justin H. Smith, 7 West Forty-third Street, New York, N. Y.; Herbert A. Kellar, McCormick Agricultural Library, Chicago, Ill.

*Committee on membership.*—Louise Fargo Brown, chairman, 263 Mill Street, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.; Elizabeth Donnan, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass.; A. C. Krey, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.; Frank E. Melvin, 737 Maine Street, Lawrence, Kans.; Richard A. Newhall, 353 Ellsworth Avenue, New Haven, Conn.; John W. Oliver, State House, Indianapolis, Ind.; Charles W. Ramsdell, University of Texas, Austin, Tex.; Arthur P. Scott, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.; J. J. Van Nostrand, jr., University of California, Berkeley, Calif.; James E. Winston, Sophie Newcomb College, New Orleans, La.

*Conference of historical societies.*—Victor H. Paltsits, chairman,<sup>2</sup> 48 Whitson Street, Forest Hills Gardens, Long Island, N. Y.; John C. Parish, secretary, State Historical Society of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.

#### COMMITTEES APPOINTED BY THE CONFERENCE

*Committee on bibliography of historical societies.*—Joseph Schafer, chairman, State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.; A. P. C. Griffin, Library of Congress, Washington, D. C.; Julius H. Tuttle, Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston, Mass.

<sup>2</sup> Elected at the business meeting of the Conference of Historical Societies.

*Committee on handbook of historical societies.*—George N. Fuller, chairman, Michigan Historical Commission, Lansing, Mich.; Solon J. Buck, Minnesota Historical Society, St. Paul, Minn.; John C. Parish, State Historical Society of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.

*Committee on national archives.*—J. Franklin Jameson, chairman, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.; Gaillard Hunt, Department of State, Washington, D. C.; Charles Moore, Library of Congress, Washington, D. C.; Eben Putnam, Wellesley Farms, Mass.; Col. Oliver L. Spaulding, jr., Historical Section, Army War College, Washington, D. C.

*Committee on bibliography.*—George M. Dutcher, chairman, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.; Henry R. Shipman, acting chairman, 27 Mercer Street, Princeton, N. J.; William H. Allison, Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y.; Sidney B. Fay, 32 Paradise Road, Northampton, Mass.; Augustus H. Shearer, The Grosvenor Library, Buffalo, N. Y.

*Subcommittee on the bibliography of American travel.*—M. M. Quaife, chairman, State Historical Library, Madison, Wis.; Solon J. Buck, Minnesota Historical Society, St. Paul, Minn.; Homer C. Hockett, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

*Public archives commission.*—Victor H. Paltsits, chairman, 48 Whitson Street, Forest Hills Gardens, Long Island, N. Y.; Solon J. Buck, Minnesota Historical Society, St. Paul, Minn.; John H. Edmonds, 438 State House, Boston 9, Mass.; Robert Burton House, North Carolina Historical Commission, Raleigh, N. C.; Waldo G. Leland, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.

*Committee on obtaining transcripts from foreign archives.*—Charles M. Andrews, chairman, 424 St. Ronan Street, New Haven, Conn.; Gaillard Hunt, Department of State, Washington, D. C.; Waldo G. Leland, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.

*Committee on military history.*—Brig. Gen. Eben Swift, chairman, Army and Navy Club, Washington, D. C.; Allen R. Boyd, Library of Congress, Washington, D. C.; Thomas R. Hay, 129 La Crosse Street, Edgewood, Pa.; Eben Putnam, Wellesley Farms, Mass.; Col. Oliver L. Spaulding, jr., historical section, Army War College, Washington, D. C.; Lt. Col. Jennings C. Wise, 735 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

*Committee on hereditary patriotic societies.*—Dixon R. Fox, chairman, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.; Natalie S. Lincoln, Editor D. A. R., Memorial Continental Hall, Washington, D. C.; Harry Brent Mackoy, Covington, Ky.; Mrs. Annie L. Sioussat, Arundel Club, Baltimore, Md.; R. C. Ballard Thruston, 1000 Columbia Building, Louisville, Ky.

*Committee on service.*—J. Franklin Jameson, chairman, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.; Elbert J. Benton, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio; Clarence S. Brigham, American Antiquarian Society, Worcester, Mass.; Worthington C. Ford, Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston, Mass.; Stella Herron, 1933 Elysian Fields, New Orleans, La.; Theodore D. Jervcy, 23 Broad Street, Charleston, S. C.; Louise Phelps Kellogg, State Historical Society, Madison, Wis.; Albert E. McKinley, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.; Herbert I. Priestley, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.; James Sullivan, State Education Building, Albany, N. Y.

*Board of editors of the Historical Outlook.*—Albert E. McKinley, managing editor, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.; Edgar Dawson, Hunter College, New York, N. Y.; Sarah A. Dynes, State Normal School, Trenton, N. J.; Daniel C. Knowlton, the Lincoln School, 646 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.; Laurence M. Larson, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.; William L. Westermann, 116 Schuyler Place, Ithaca, N. Y.

*Committee on historical research in colleges.*—William K. Boyd, chairman, Trinity College, Durham, N. C.; E. Merton Coulter, University of Georgia, Athens, Ga.; Benjamin B. Kendrick, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.; Asa E. Martin, Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pa.; William W. Sweet, DePauw University, Greencastle, Ind.

*Committee on the George L. Beer prize.*—Bernadotte E. Schmitt, chairman, 1938 East One hundred and sixteenth Street, Cleveland, Ohio; George H. Blakeslee, Clark University, Worcester, Mass.; Robert H. Lord, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.; Jesse S. Reeves, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.; Mason W. Tyler, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.

*Committee on history teaching in the schools.*—Guy Stanton Ford, chairman, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.; Henry E. Bourne, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio; Philip P. Chase, 241 Highland Street, Milton, Mass.; Henry Johnson, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.; Daniel C. Knowlton, the Lincoln School, 646 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.; Albert E. McKinley, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.; Arthur M. Schlesinger, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa; Eugene M. Violette, Kirksville, Mo.

*Representatives in National Council of Teachers of Social Studies.*—Henry Johnson, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.; Arthur M. Schlesinger, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.

*Committee on endowment.*—Charles Moore, chairman, Library of Congress, Washington, D. C.

*Committee on the University Center in Washington.*—J. F. Jameson, chairman, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.; Gaillard Hunt, State Department, Washington, D. C.; H. Barrett Learned, 2123 Bancroft Place, Washington, D. C.; W. G. Leland, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.; Charles Moore, Library of Congress, Washington, D. C.

*Board of editors, Studies in European history.*—George B. Adams, chairman, 57 Edgehill Road, New Haven, Conn.; Arthur E. R. Boak, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.; Robert H. Lord, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.; Wallace Notestein, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.; James Westfall Thompson, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

#### SPECIAL COMMITTEES OF THE ASSOCIATION

*Committee on bibliography of modern English history.*—Edward P. Cheyney, chairman, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.; Arthur L. Cross, 705 South State Street, Ann Arbor, Mich.; Roger B. Merriman, 175 Brattle Street, Cambridge, Mass.; Wallace Notestein, 237 Goldwin Smith Hall, Ithaca, N. Y.; Conyers Read, 1218 Snyder Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa.

*Committee on the Historical Congress at Rio de Janeiro.*—John B. Stetson, Jr., chairman, Elkins Park, Pa.; Percy A. Martin, vice chairman, Leland Stanford Junior University, Stanford University, Calif.; James A. Robertson, secretary, 1422 Irving Street NE, Washington, D. C.; Charles Lyon Chandler, Corn Exchange National Bank, Philadelphia, Pa.; Isaac J. Cox, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.; Charles H. Cunningham, University of Texas, Austin, Tex.; Julius Klein, Cosmos Club, Washington, D. C.; Manoel de Oliveira Lima, 3536 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Edwin V. Morgan, American Embassy, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil; Constantine E. McGuire, Cosmos Club, Washington, D. C.; William S. Schurz, 606 East Ann Street, Ann Arbor, Mich.

*Committee on the documentary historical publications of the United States.*—J. Franklin Jameson, chairman, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.; Charles Moore, Library of Congress, Washington, D. C.

*Committee on the writing of history.*—Ambassador Jean Jules Jusserand, chairman, French Embassy, Washington, D. C.; John S. Bassett, secretary, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.; Wilbur C. Abbott, 74 Sparks Street, Cambridge, Mass.; Charles W. Colby, 253 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

*Committee to cooperate with the Peoples of America Society in the study of race elements in the United States.*—John S. Bassett, chairman, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.; Frederic L. Paxson, 2122 Van Hise Avenue, Madison, Wis.

*Committee on the Brussels Historical Congress.*—J. Franklin Jameson, chairman, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.; Clarence W. Alvord, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.; Carl Russell Fish, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.; Tenney Frank, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.; Waldo G. Leland, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.; James T. Shotwell, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.; Paul Van Dyke, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.

---

## ORGANIZATION AND ACTIVITIES

The American Historical Association is the national organization for the promotion of historical writing and studies in the United States. It was founded in 1884 by a group of representative scholars, and in 1889 was chartered by Congress. Its national character is emphasized by fixing its principal office in Washington and by providing for the publication of its annual reports by the United States Government through the secretary of the Smithsonian Institution. The membership of the association, at present over 2,600, is drawn from every State in the Union, as well as from Canada and South America. It includes representatives of all the professions and many of the various business and commercial pursuits. To all who desire to promote the development of history—local, national, or general—and to all who believe that a correct knowledge of the past is essential to a right understanding of the present the association makes a strong appeal through its publications and other activities.

The meetings of the association are held annually during the last week in December in cities so chosen as to accommodate in turn the members living in different parts of the country, and the average attendance is about 400. The meetings afford an opportunity for members to become personally acquainted and to discuss matters in which they have a common interest.

The principal publications of the association are the Annual Report and the American Historical Review. The former, usually in two volumes, is printed for the association by the Government and is distributed free to all members who desire it. It contains the proceedings of the association, including the more important papers read at the annual meetings, as well as valuable collections of documents, edited by the historical manuscripts commission; reports on American archives, prepared by the public archives commission; bibliographical contributions; reports on history teaching, on the activities of historical societies, and other agencies, etc.; and an annual group of papers on agricultural history contributed by the Agricultural History Society. The American Historical Review is the official organ of the association and the recognized organ of the historical profession in the United States. It is published quarterly, each number containing about 200 pages. It presents to the reader authoritative

articles, critical reviews of important new works on history, notices of inedited documents, and the news of all other kinds of historical activities. The Review is indispensable to all who wish to keep abreast of the progress of historical scholarship, and is of much value and interest to the general reader. It is distributed free to all members of the association.

For the encouragement of historical research the association offers two biennial prizes, each of \$200, for the best printed or manuscript monograph in the English language submitted by a writer residing in the Western Hemisphere who has not achieved an established reputation. The Justin Winsor prize, offered in the even years, is awarded to an essay in the history of the Western Hemisphere, including the insular possessions of the United States. In odd years the Herbert Baxter Adams prize is awarded for an essay in the history of the Eastern Hemisphere.

The association also offers the George Louis Beer prize in European international history. This prize is \$250 and, in accordance with the terms of a bequest by the late George Louis Beer, of New York City, will be awarded annually to a citizen of the United States for the best work on European international history since 1895.

To the subject of history teaching the association has devoted much and consistent attention through conferences held at the annual meetings, the investigations of committees and the preparation of reports. The association appoints the board of editors of *The Historical Outlook*, thus assuming a certain responsibility for that valuable organ of the history-teaching profession. At the close of the war a special committee was appointed on the revision of the historical program in all schools under college grade.

The association maintains close relations with the State and local historical societies through a conference organized under the auspices of the association and holding a meeting each year in connection with the annual meeting of the association. In this meeting of delegates the various societies discuss such problems as the collection and editing of historical material, the maintenance of museums and libraries, the fostering of popular interest in historical matters, the marking of sites, the observance of historical anniversaries, etc. The proceedings of the conference are printed in the *Annual Reports* of the association.

The Pacific Coast Branch of the association, organized in 1904, affords an opportunity for the members living in the Far West to have meetings and an organization of their own while retaining full membership in the parent body. In 1915 the association met with the branch in San Francisco, Berkeley, and Palo Alto in celebration of the opening of the Panama Canal. The proceedings of this meeting, devoted to the history of the Pacific and the countries about it, have been published in a separate volume.

From the first the association has pursued the policy of inviting to its membership not only those professionally or otherwise actively engaged in historical work, but also those whose interest in history or in the advancement of historical science is such that they wish to ally themselves with the association in the furtherance of its various objects. Thus the association counts among its members lawyers, clergymen, editors, publishers, physicians, officers of the Army and Navy, merchants, bankers, and farmers, all of whom find material of especial interest in the publications of the association.

Membership in the association is obtained through election by the executive council, upon nomination by a member or by direct application. The annual dues are \$5, there being no initiation fee. The fee for life membership is \$100, which secures exemption from all annual dues.

Inquiries respecting the association, its work, publications, prizes, meetings, memberships, etc., should be addressed to the assistant secretary of the association at 1140 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C., from whom they will receive prompt attention.

---

## HISTORICAL PRIZES

## JUSTIN WINSOR AND HERBERT BAXTER ADAMS PRIZES

For the purpose of encouraging historical research the American Historical Association offers two prizes, each prize of \$200: the Justin Winsor prize in American history and the Herbert Baxter Adams prize in the history of the Eastern Hemisphere. The Winsor prize is offered in the even years (as heretofore), and the Adams prize in the odd years. Both prizes are designed to encourage writers who have not published previously any considerable work or obtained an established reputation. Either prize shall be awarded for an excellent monograph of essay, printed or in manuscript, submitted to or selected by the committee of award. Monographs must be submitted on or before July 1 of the given year. In the case of a printed monograph the date of publication must fall within a period of two years prior to July 1. A monograph to which a prize has been awarded in manuscript may, if it is deemed in all respects available, be published in the annual report of the association. Competition shall be limited to monographs written or published in the English language by writers of the Western Hemisphere.

In making the award the committee will consider not only research, accuracy, and originality but also clearness of expression and logical arrangement. The successful monograph must reveal marked excellence of style. Its subject matter should afford a distinct contribution to knowledge of a sort beyond that having merely personal or local interest. The monograph must conform to the accepted canons of historical research and criticism. A manuscript—including text, notes, bibliography, appendices, etc.—must not exceed 100,000 words if designed for publication in the annual report of the association.

*The Justin Winsor prize.*—The monograph must be based upon independent and original investigation in American history. The phrase "American history" includes the history of the United States and other countries of the Western Hemisphere. The monograph may deal with any aspect or phase of that history.

*The Herbert Baxter Adams prize.*—The monograph must be based upon independent and original investigation in the history of the Eastern Hemisphere. The monograph may deal with any aspect or phase of that history, as in the case of the Winsor prize.

## GEORGE LOUIS BEER PRIZE

In accordance with the terms of a bequest by the late George Louis Beer, of New York City, the American Historical Association announces the George Louis Beer prize in European international history. The prize will be \$250 in cash, and will be awarded annually for the best work upon "any phase of European international history since 1895."

The competition is limited to citizens of the United States and to works that shall be submitted to the American Historical Association. A work may be submitted in either manuscript or print, and it should not exceed in length 50,000 words of text, with the additional necessary notes, bibliography, appendices, etc.

Works must be submitted on or before July 1 of each year in order to be considered for the competition of that year. In the case of printed works the date of publication must fall within a period of 18 months prior to July 1.

A work submitted in competition for the Herbert Baxter Adams prize may at the same time, if its subject meets the requirements, be submitted for the George Lou's Beer prize; but no work that shall have been so submitted for both prizes will be admitted to the competition for the Beer prize in any subsequent year.

In making the award the committee in charge will consider not only research, accuracy, and originality but also clearness of expression, logical arrangement, and general excellence of style.

The prize is designed especially to encourage those who have not published previously any considerable work nor obtained an established reputation.

Only works in the English language will receive consideration.

Inquiries concerning these prizes should be addressed to the chairmen of the respective committees, or to the Secretary of the American Historical Association, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.

The Justin Winsor prize (which until 1906 was offered annually) has been awarded to the following:

1896. Herman V. Ames: "The proposed amendments to the Constitution of the United States."

1900. William A. Schaper: "Sectionalism and representation in South Carolina"; with honorable mention of Mary S. Locke: "Antislavery sentiment before 1808."

1901. Ulrich B. Phillips: "Georgia and State rights"; with honorable mention of M. Louise Green: "The struggle for religious liberty in Connecticut."

1902. Charles McCarthy: "The Anti-Masonic Party"; with honorable mention of W. Roy Smith: "South Carolina as a royal province."

1903. Louise Phelps Kellogg: "The American colonial charter: A study of its relation to English administration, chiefly after 1688."

1904. William R. Manning: "The Nootka Sound controversy"; with honorable mention of C. O. Paullin: "The Navy of the American Revolution."

1906. Annie Heloise Abel: "The history of events resulting in Indian consolidation west of the Mississippi River."

1908. Clarence Edwin Carter: "Great Britain and the Illinois country, 1765-1774"; with honorable mention of Charles Henry Ambler: "Sectionalism in Virginia, 1776-1861."

1910. Edward Raymond Turner: "The Negro in Pennsylvania: Slavery—servitude—freedom, 1639-1861."

1912. Arthur Charles Cole: "The Whig Party in the South."

1914. Mary W. Williams: "Anglo-American Isthmian diplomacy, 1815-1915."

1916. Richard J. Purcell: "Connecticut in transition, 1775-1818."

1918. Arthur M. Schlesinger: "The Colonial merchants and the American Revolution, 1763-1776." (Columbia University Studies in History, etc., No. 182.)

1920. F. Lee Benms: "The American struggle for the British West India carrying-trade, 1815-1830."

From 1897 to 1899 and in 1905 the Justin Winsor prize was not awarded.

The Herbert Baxter Adams prize has been awarded to:

1905. David S. Muzzey: "The spiritual Franciscans"; with honorable mention of Eloise Ellery: "Jean Pierre Brissot."

1907. In equal division, Edward B. Krehbiel, "The Interdict: Its history and its operation, with especial attention to the time of Pope Innocent III";

and William S. Robertson: "Francisco de Miranda and the revolutionizing of Spanish America."

1909. Wallace Notestein: "A history of witchcraft in England from 1538 to 1718."

1911. Louise Fargo Brown: "The political activities of the Baptists and Fifth Monarchy men in England during the Interregnum."

1913. Violet Barbour: "Henry Bennet, Earl of Arlington."

1915. Theodore C. Pease, "The leveller movement"; with honorable mention of F. C. Melvin, "Napoleon's system of licensed navigation, 1806-1814."

1917. Frederick L. Nussbaum: "Commercial policy in the French Revolution: a study of the career of G. J. A. Ducher."

1919. William Thomas Morgan: "English political parties and leaders in the reign of Queen Anne, 1702-1710." (Yale Historical Publications, Miscellany, VII. New Haven, Yale University Press.)

1921. Einar Joranson: "The Danegeld in France."

The essays of Messrs. Muzzey, Krehbiel, Carter, Notestein, Turner, Cole, Pease, Purcell, Nussbaum,<sup>1</sup> Miss Brown, Miss Barbour, and Miss Williams have been published by the association in a series of separate volumes. The earlier Winsor prize essays were printed in the annual reports.

## STATISTICS OF MEMBERSHIP

December 15, 1921

### I. GENERAL

Total membership	2,633
Life	116
Annual	3,286
Institutions	231
Total paid membership, including life members	2,106
Delinquent (total)	527
Since last bill	502
For one year	25
Loss (total)	219
Deaths	29
Resignations	67
Dropped	123
Gain (total)	328
Life	4
Annual	309
Institutions	15
Total number of elections	304
Net gain or loss	109

### II. BY REGIONS

New England: Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut	387
North Atlantic: New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia	828
South Atlantic: Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida	159

<sup>1</sup> Published in 1923.

North Central: Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin-----	517
South Central: Alabama, Mississippi, Tennessee, Kentucky, West Virginia-----	72
West Central: Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, Arkansas, Louisiana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas-----	324
Pacific coast: Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Idaho, Utah, Nevada, Arizona, Washington, Oregon, California-----	242
Territories: Porto Rico, Alaska, Hawaii, Philippine Islands-----	7
Other countries-----	97

3, 633

## III. BY STATES

	Members	New members, 1921		Members	New members, 1921
Alabama-----	9	2	New Hampshire----	28	1
Alaska-----			New Jersey-----	73	6
Arizona-----	5	1	New Mexico-----	7	1
Arkansas-----	6	2	New York-----	389	52
California-----	138	12	North Carolina----	30	3
Colorado-----	18	1	North Dakota-----	9	1
Connecticut-----	86	2	Ohio-----	118	11
Delaware-----	11		Oklahoma-----	14	3
District of Columbia-----	126	30	Oregon-----	20	3
Florida-----	8	1	Pennsylvania-----	166	17
Georgia-----	29	4	Philippine Islands----	3	
Hawaii-----	2	1	Porto Rico-----	2	
Idaho-----	8	2	Rhode Island-----	22	3
Illinois-----	182	15	South Carolina-----	19	1
Indiana-----	54	5	South Dakota-----	11	1
Iowa-----	47	7	Tennessee-----	17	2
Kansas-----	31	5	Texas-----	44	5
Kentucky-----	22	4	Utah-----	6	
Louisiana-----	13		Vermont-----	11	3
Maine-----	14	2	Virginia-----	73	12
Maryland-----	63	9	Washington-----	26	2
Massachusetts-----	226	11	West Virginia-----	19	5
Michigan-----	90	11	Wisconsin-----	73	12
Minnesota-----	51	7	Wyoming-----	2	
Mississippi-----	5	1	Canada-----	31	2
Missouri-----	76	34	Cuba-----	2	
Montana-----	8	1	Latin-America-----	5	1
Nebraska-----	22	1	Foreign-----	59	10
Nevada-----	4		Total-----	2, 633	328

---

---

I. PROCEEDINGS OF THE THIRTY-SIXTH ANNUAL MEETING  
OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

---

ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI, DECEMBER 27-30, 1921

---

---



## THE MEETING OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION AT ST. LOUIS<sup>1</sup>

"Pocimur," if one may borrow an exordium from Horace, and freely translate it, "We are put to it." It is expected and required of the editor of the American Historical Review that in each April number there shall be one article "covering" the then recent annual meeting of the American Historical Association. It is a large order, when a meeting consists of 25 sessions, held in 11 different places, and in some instances held three or four at a time, and including in the aggregate at least 65 papers. It may be that so prodigious a bill of fare is welcome to most of those who attend, each member being sure to find something that interests him, something that lies in or near his "specialty." It may be that no one but the reporter of the proceedings is confused by their multiplicity. Yet sometimes the thought arises that it is not the soundest appetites which are ministered to by the complicated hotel menu and that healthy minds might well ask the question—

What neat repast shall feast us, light and choice,  
Of Attic taste?

The experiment of a simple program of high quality might well be tried and might have unifying effects of considerable value.

Howsoever these things may be, the attempt to deal with the St. Louis meeting must nevertheless be made. No one has the right to expect that such a chronicle shall be highly readable, but perhaps it is possible this year to lighten it by some omissions. By decree of the association a year ago, upon recommendation from the committee on policy, it was resolved that hereafter a carefully composed summary of each paper read at any meeting should appear in the annual report, whether the full text of the paper were printed in that volume or elsewhere or not at all. In view of the fact that some account of each paper will thus be accessible in print, it may be less necessary than heretofore that each should be summarized in these pages.

It added to the diversity, though also to the pleasure and interest of the occasion, that several other historical societies met at St. Louis during the same days, December 28, 29, and 30, 1921. With the Agricultural History Society, which by treaty has an organic relation to the American Historical Association, there were two joint sessions

---

<sup>1</sup> This account of the St. Louis meeting is taken, with some modifications and abridgements, from the American Historical Review for April, 1922.

devoted to the agricultural history of the United States. With the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, many of whose members are also members of the older body, there was a joint session devoted to topics in the earlier economic history of the Mississippi Valley, and that society had also a subscription dinner on the evening of the 27th. The American Catholic Historical Association also began its sessions with a dinner on that evening; this was followed on the ensuing days by sessions comprising many interesting papers in American and European church history, by fruitful practical conferences on the general bibliography of church history, on Catholic archives in the United States, and on Catholic historical publications, and finally by a general session in which Prof. James J. Walsh, president of the society, read his presidential address, on "The Church and peace movements in the past." Much active interest, with promise of much useful work in the future, was manifested in the meetings of all three of these societies. Two other organizations which convened at the same time were the Missouri Historical Society, of St. Louis, and the State Historical Society of Missouri, of Columbia, both of which participated in the exercises of the second evening, when there was a general session commemorative of the centennial anniversary of the admission of Missouri into the Union in 1821.

But besides the elements of diversity, there were of course also elements making for unity. The hotel in which headquarters were established, the Planters Hotel, gave abundant opportunities for conversation and sociability. The Missouri Historical Society entertained the guests on one of the evenings at the city club with a "smoker" for the men and a reception for the women; and there were several occasions on which the society came together as a whole, and not in specialized sections. Most notable of these was the dinner offered to all the members by the trustees of the Missouri Botanical Garden, founded as an institution 33 years ago by the will of Henry Shaw, of St. Louis. After the dinner an address of welcome was delivered by Dr. Frederic A. Hall, chancellor of Washington University; and the president of the association, the French ambassador, Mr. Jusserand, delivered the brilliant and instructive address which appears in the April, 1922, number of the Review.

Another unifying, and very agreeable, occasion was the luncheon hospitably offered by Washington University on the second day, which gave members a gratifying opportunity to see the noteworthy campus and buildings of that institution, in whose halls most of the exercises of that day took place. To these should be added two general sessions, in which, with no alternative program to attract them elsewhere, members listened to the commemoration of the

Missouri centennial, already mentioned, and to a group of papers in French history; at the latter session—held, it will be remembered, on soil that once was French—the ambassador of France presided.

The local arrangements, despite the number of places involved, ran very smoothly. For them the association was indebted to the local committee headed by Mr. William K. Bixby and Mr. Charles P. Pettus, and especially to Prof. Thomas M. Marshall, of Washington University. Evidently the committee must have exerted itself valiantly on the side of publicity also, for the St. Louis newspapers gave the meeting an amount of attention to which the association is not accustomed; ordinarily, in the cities where the association meets, the newspapers devote less space to the lucubrations of the historians than to the local weather, the latest bankruptcy, or the firemen's ball.

By a very gratifying action on the part of the railroad authorities, a reduction of fares such as used to be granted before the war was accorded once more on this occasion, though the number of attendants required in order to secure the concession was placed at a height which it will often be difficult for the combined societies to reach. The registration of the American Historical Association at this thirty-sixth annual meeting was 325, as against 360 at the thirty-fifth. The difference is only such as could be accounted for by the greater distances by which western members are separated from St. Louis as compared with those which separate the average eastern member from Washington, and the attendance may be regarded as excellent even upon pre-war standards.

The chairman of the committee on the program was Prof. Evarts B. Greene, who provided what was, by general agreement, an unusually interesting program.

In accordance with the customary form of these annual surveys, one may well report first upon the various practical conferences before speaking of those papers which lend themselves more readily to a systematic or chronological order. First, then, of the conference on the teaching of history in schools. Its topic was that which has been so anxiously debated in recent years, that of the relations in the school curriculum between history and the other social sciences or studies. The two papers which served as the basis of discussion were one by Prof. Rolla M. Tryon, of the University of Chicago, describing various forms of adjustment practiced in elementary and secondary schools—independent courses, simultaneous or successive, in history and the cognate studies, and courses in which all these elements are fused, during either the whole or the earlier part of the curriculum—and one by Prof. Eugene M. Violette, of the State Teachers' College at Kirksville, Mo., on the various adjustments possible in the curriculum of the college. The discussion showed

plainly the perplexities of the present situation, the uncertainty as to how the contending claims of all these studies upon the pupil's time and mind, or, more exactly, upon the minds of school superintendents, can be reconciled. It would appear that it can only be done by joint effort of the representatives of all these studies in some one organic body. With this in view, though many efforts at solution of the problems may prove helpful, especial interest attaches to those undertaken by the National Council of Teachers of Social Studies,<sup>2</sup> a body formed for just such cooperative study, and in which it was intended that the American Historical Association, the American Economic Association, the American Political Science Association, and the American Sociological Society should each be represented. The executive council of the association at this session requested the committee on history teaching in the schools to take an active part in the movement of cooperation, which seems to be indicated as affording the best pathway out of the existing perplexities, and appointed as its representatives two members of that committee, Professors Henry Johnson and Arthur M. Schlesinger.

In the conference of archivists the question how the States can be persuaded to take better care of their archives was discussed in the light of the experience of Iowa, with many helpful practical suggestions, by Mr. C. C. Stiles, of the Iowa State Department of History, and in the light of Connecticut experience by Mr. George S. Godard, of the Connecticut State Library. Mr. Victor H. Paltsits, chairman of the association's public archives commission, read a history of its achievements during the 22 years of its existence, and there was some discussion of its future, in view of the fact that the reports upon the contents of State archives, which have constituted its chief published work, are now nearly completed.

The conference of historical societies, which enjoys a certain degree of autonomy under the auspices of the association, elected Mr. Paltsits as its president for the next two years. Two papers were read in its session. In the first Dr. Newton D. Mereness described the different varieties of historical material in Washington having value for the individual State—papers in the War Department relating to frontier defense, in the Indian Office relating to Indian relations, in the Department of State relating to the administration of territorial governments, in the Post Office Department relating to the development of communications and transportation, in the General Land Office on land matters, and in the House and Senate files on all these subjects. Dr. Theodore C. Pease, of the Illinois State Historical Library, in a paper on historical materials in the depositories of the Middle West, showed how collections of historical material in

---

<sup>2</sup> More recently named National Council for the Social Studies.

that region had developed under a succession of concepts as to what constitutes history—from that view which made it consist almost solely in glorifying the heroes of the frontier and the wars of the Republic to the study of past politics as history, and ultimately to broadening inclusion of the economic, social, and religious aspects of the history of the State and of the whole region of which it forms a part.

For less formal consideration of special fields in which groups of members have a practical and effective interest there were several “luncheon conferences,” and a “dinner conference” of those especially interested in the work of the hereditary patriotic societies. At the preceding annual meeting the council had appointed a special committee on relations with these societies, and this committee, under the efficient chairmanship of Prof. Dixon R. Fox, of Columbia University, has made considerable progress in drawing the representatives of those societies into common consultation on matters of historical interest.

The topics of the respective luncheon conferences were: The history of science, that of the Great War, English history, American colonial history, Hispanic-American history, and the history of the Far East. The original intention respecting these conferences, when they were instituted some years ago, was that they should be occupied with free and informal discussion, especially with practical discussion as to what tasks or problems most deserved to have the labor of scholars expended upon them, and in what manner that labor might best be directed, the prime objects being the exchange of experience and the promotion of scientific work. But though these conferences, as they now run, by no means lack those elements of interest, in the main they have come to consist of formal written papers, often no different in character from those read in the main sessions—and no shorter. It would seem as if college professors, accustomed to talk informally to classes several times a week, might cut loose on these occasions from written texts, and, if there are tasks in their fields which they wish to urge others to engage or cooperate in, tasks suffering to be undertaken, might be aware of the superior hortatory power which resides in the spoken word as compared with the 10-minute or 30-minute “paper.”

The free and characteristic talk of Professor Breasted on wheat in ancient Egypt, and like topics, in the conference on the history of science, and that of Professor Haskins on opportunities for research in the history of science afforded by European libraries, were examples of the value and attractiveness of this method. Another theme interestingly handled in that conference was that of Prof. Archer

B. Hulbert, of Colorado College, the various ways in which the natural sciences can be invoked to aid in the study of American history.

In the conference on the history of the Great War, Dr. Wayne E. Stevens, of Dartmouth College, described, with illustrations, the critical problems involved in the use of the official records of that war, problems of both external and internal criticism, attended by difficulties arising out of the enormous volume and varied character of the material, the multitude of inaccurate and unauthentic versions of documents, the haste with which documents were prepared, their technical language, and the various factors of human and military fallibility. Capt. Shipley Thomas described the contribution made to the history of the war by a group of officers of the American Expeditionary Force, mostly regimental intelligence officers, one from each combat-unit, who were assembled at Langres for the purpose, a few days after the armistice, and for two months were occupied with the study and discussion of the military operations in which they had taken part.

In the "luncheon conference" on English history, Prof. Arthur L. Cross, of the University of Michigan, indicated the dangers involved in the growing tendency to lay the chief emphasis, in historical teaching, on recent history and world-history. Also he pointed out the advantage of legal history as a teaching instrument. A paper on this subject, the need of the study of legal history by the law student or by college students preparing for the law school, by Prof. Clarence C. Crawford, of the University of Kansas, was read at this luncheon, and one by Prof. Clarence Perkins, of the University of North Dakota, on "Electioneering in the time of Sir Robert Walpole."

The conference on American colonial history realized most completely the original ideal of these conferences, the speakers directing attention to a large number of fields calling urgently for more thorough research and indicating methods or materials for their cultivation. Thus, Professor Root of Wisconsin dwelt on the financial relations between England and the colonies as deserving further study, Professor Bond of Cincinnati on studies concerning colonial agents and concerning the relations between different regions in the colonial period, Professor Gipson of Wabash College on possibilities in the field of eighteenth-century colonial biography.

In the conference on Hispanic-American history, Professor Hackett, of the University of Texas, described the materials for Spanish history to be found in the library of the late Señor Genaro García, of Mexico, recently acquired by that institution; Dr. Arthur S. Aiton, of Michigan, discussed the establishment of the viceroyalty in the New World under Mendoza as a projection into that continent of a Spanish institution which had already had a long development

in Spain itself; and Professor Robertson, of Illinois, read a paper on the policy of Spain toward her revolted colonies in 1823-24.

Finally, in the conference on the history of the Far East, Professor Rostovtzeff, of Wisconsin, sketched the history of the influence of the art of Central Asia on South Russia and China, and a paper was read on Prince Shotoku and the Taikwa Reform in Japan in 645 A. D. by Mr. Langdon Warner, director of the Pennsylvania Museum in Philadelphia.

Of the more formal sessions devoted to the reading and consideration of formal papers, the one which had the widest scope, and which may therefore deserve to be first spoken of, was a session devoted to the history of civilization. In opening it, its chairman, Professor Breasted, of Chicago, in an extended paper entitled "New light on the origins of civilization," adverted to the new opportunities for exploration and study in the Near East opened up by recent events, and to the want of adequate organization in America for exploiting these opportunities. He then passed to a description of the organization and methods of the Oriental Institute established at the University of Chicago, its collections, and its undertaking to edit, with much European aid, those early Egyptian coffin inscriptions, archaic forerunners of the Book of the Dead, which should present us with our first chapters in the history of religion and morals. He then described his very interesting and fruitful archaeological expedition of 1920 in Egypt, Babylonia, Assyria, and Syria. Finally, from general considerations respecting the origins of civilization he passed to the origins of science in particular, and described the contents of the Edwin Smith medical papyrus of the sixteenth century B. C., now belonging to the New York Historical Society.

In the same session, Prof. Ferdinand Schevill, of the same university, speaking on "The relation of the fine arts to the history of civilization," mentioned with emphasis that the history of the fine arts could not be brought into accord with those theories respecting progress which are now dominant in the study of history. Gen. Eben Swift, United States Army, had a paper upon the development of the art of war, Prof. William L. Westermann, of Cornell University, on historical aspects of commerce and economics, especially on the difficulties attending their treatment in respect to periods prior to the existence of trustworthy statistics.

In a session specially devoted to economic history, Prof. N. S. B. Gras, of the University of Minnesota, read a paper on "The development of metropolitan economy in Europe and America."<sup>3</sup> That of Prof. Harry E. Barnes, of Clark University, on "The significance of sociology for economic and social history," dwelt on the impossibility

---

of treating these subjects suitably without possessing an adequate knowledge of sociology, and of sociology in its latest and most satisfactory and most inclusive forms. While sociology, he said, furnishes the historian with his knowledge of the principles and patterns of human behavior, with which alone he can proceed intelligently in historical synthesis, the historian can provide the sociologist with invaluable genetic and comparative data, by recourse to which the sociologist can vastly improve the breadth and accuracy of his subject. "There is no danger of sociology engulfing or absorbing history. There will always be an ample opportunity for productive labor in gathering the concrete material descriptive of human progress." The last part of the paper was given to specific illustrations of the workings of the chief sociological factors in history.

The papers on ancient history, in the session set apart for that subject, were all concerned with the history of the Roman Empire. Recent advances in our knowledge of that field were indicated by Prof. A. E. R. Boak, of Michigan, who adverted especially to the modern debates respecting the nature and theory of the principate, the worship of the emperor, the growth of the bureaucracy, the origin of the colonate, the religious transformations, the influence of Egypt and of Parthia. Prof. Frank B. Marsh, of Texas, endeavored to show to what extent and in what sense we may rightly regard the Empire as a continuation of the Republic, and, urging the need of emancipating our minds from the influence of literary sources originating in the Antonine period, argued that Augustus made a serious effort to conform his settlement of the world to the old republican and aristocratic tradition. Prof. Charles H. Oldfather, of Wabash College, described the chief varieties of new light from the papyri, dwelling particularly on their contribution to our knowledge of administration and of economic conditions in Egypt.

Of the papers in medieval history, that of Prof. August C. Krey, of Minnesota, on "The international state of the Middle Ages and some reasons for its downfall." That of Prof. Louis J. Pactow, of California, on "The twelfth and thirteenth centuries in the history of culture" was largely a plea for a fuller study of medieval Latin, and even for its use as an international language in our time. That of Prof. Lynn Thorndike, of Western Reserve University, on Guido Bonatti, dealt with an astrologer of the thirteenth century, placed by Dante in the eighth circle of the Inferno, and especially with his *Liber Astronomicus*.

Mention has already been made of an afternoon session occupied with the history of France. Of its five papers, four related to French history of the last 200 years, one, that of Prof. Earle W. Dow, of Michigan, to a medieval theme, that of town privileges

under the "Établissements de Rouen," a subject which derives its importance from the fact that the Rouennese system was adopted, wholly or in part, by some 30 or more French towns, from the Channel to the Pyrenees. The ducal or royal charters of various dates from 1144 to 1278, and the communal Établissements were carefully analyzed, their development traced, and allusion made to the light they cast on municipal life. Prof. Albert F. Guérard, of the Rice Institute, followed with a paper of marked excellence of literary quality, fair and discriminating, on Voltaire's philosophy of history as shown in the *Essai sur les Moeurs*, the *Histoire de la Civilisation*, and the *Siècle de Louis XIV*, and on the rational humanitarianism which he represented. Monsieur Bernard Fay, of Paris, in a paper characterized by similar felicity of expression, yet by much evidence of research, discussed the close relations between the revolutionary philosophy in France and in the United States at the end of the eighteenth century—Luzerne's press, Vergennes's *Nouvelles d'Angleterre et d'Amérique*, the manner in which the young French revolutionaries brought American ideas of politics and morals to bear on bourgeois minds (moral ideas more permanently than political), and after the moral bankruptcy of the Directory the manner in which Madame de Staël, Benjamin Constant, Châteaubriand used their ideas of American society in their efforts toward a new catholicism. Professor Fling, of Nebraska, gave a sketch of the history of the French Revolution; Professor Hazen, of Columbia University, described the part which France has played in liberating other countries—Greece, Belgium, Rumania, and Italy.<sup>4</sup>

Europe after the Congress of Vienna was the general subject of another session, with papers by Prof. William A. Frayer, of Michigan, "A criticism of the Italian settlement of 1815"; by Prof. Robert J. Kerner, of Missouri, on "Nationalism and the Metternich system"; by Prof. Parker T. Moon, of Columbia University, on "British jealousy of French imperialism after 1815"; and by Prof. J. M. S. Allison, of Yale University, on "The July days and after." Professor Frayer urged that Italy having no man capable of ruling the whole peninsula to divide it again into individual states, checking and balancing each other, was a more defensible policy than had commonly been thought, and indeed was practically inevitable. Doctor Kerner drew from the failure of Metternich's policy of repressing nationalism a hundred years ago the lesson that, however, nationalism may prove to be outworn in regions of Europe already industrialized and otherwise economically advanced, it marks a necessary stage in the evolution of the new, chiefly agricultural, states lying to the eastward. Professor Allison's main effort was to ac-

---

<sup>4</sup> Printed in the *North American Review* for April, 1922.

count for the failure of the government of Louis Philippe. He considered its downfall to have been due not to the laborers but to the radical leaders, who, though unorganized and discordant, were able under the leadership of the Friends of the People to take sufficient advantage of the ministry's instability to wreck the general control.

In the session arranged for military history, after a paper by Col. Charles R. Howland, United States Army, on "The causes of the World War," Col. Conrad H. Lanza read one on "The Thirty-fifth Division on September 29, 1918," of particular interest to a St. Louis audience because that division consisted largely of Missouri and Kansas troops. The incident discussed occurred in the Ardennes, the division having a position on the right bank of the Aire. An attack which it was to make on the morning of the day named proved a failure, and the division was "withdrawn for reorganization," but Colonel Lanza showed in detail that the responsibility for the failure must be widely distributed, that it was due to misunderstandings and blunders on the part of many officers in Army, corps, division, and brigade staffs.

Few, if any, of the sessions evoked more interest than that which was devoted to the history of the American Revolution. It gave gratifying evidence that, though school-board politicians and members of legislatures still regard that history as solely a series of military events, in which the children of light, uniformly animated by the most glorious and unexampled patriotism, were uniformly victorious over the base children of darkness, serious students of history in increasing numbers take a rational view of the episode, and study it as they would study any other portion of history, with an eye chiefly to the political and social developments involved. This was made especially manifest in the discussion which followed the papers, in which Professors McLaughlin, Becker, Schlesinger, and Morison all took an illuminating part, and which, in a degree unusual in our meetings, was real discussion. The papers were two. Prof. Claude H. Van Tyne, of Michigan, in his paper on "The American Revolution in the light of the last two decades of research," described and critically discussed the contributions made to a sounder knowledge of the period by various investigators, including the late George L. Beer and Professors Alvord, Becker, and Andrews, with exposition of the present-day opinion.

In the other paper, entitled "In re the American People v. George III," Prof. Clarence W. Alvord, of Minnesota, opposed to the older habit of ascribing all objectionable legislation to the sole influence of George III, the need of more thorough and discriminating study of the views and actions of the politicians who surrounded him. Doctor Alvord maintained the hypothesis that the factions of George Grenville and of the Duke of Bedford, desiring vindication for the repeal of the stamp tax, were the leaders in ministry and Parliament

who caused the American Revolution. The active causes in the colonies were the financial depression succeeding the French and Indian War, the development of a non-English people in the colonies, and the propaganda put forth first for political purposes and then for the gaining of independence. The remarks of Professor Schlesinger included some very pertinent suggestions as to lines along which the history of this propaganda might well be further pursued.

The other period of American history to which a session was given was that of the generation following the Civil War. Mr. Paul L. Haworth, of Indiana, opened the session by a discussion of the emergence of the problems of the period out of war and reconstruction. The question of the status of the former Confederates and of that of the seceded States proved comparatively simple. The problem of the Negro was more difficult and remains unsolved, though by reason of his having been left economically dependent upon his former master no very acute labor problem has arisen. But in the years from 1865 to 1877 financial problems of great importance claimed attention, problems connected with the debt, the tariff, and the currency, and in the field of economics the stimulation of manufactures accelerated the transition from the agricultural to the industrial age, forcing to the front new questions, for whose solution the American mind was ill prepared.

Prof. Theodore C. Smith, of Williams College, illustrated the Congressional dealings with these problems, and especially with those of finance, in a paper on "Light on the period from the Garfield papers." The collection was described as a rich mine of information on Congressional and party history from 1863 to 1880, but especially for the period after 1875, when, the Democratic Party controlling the House, Garfield became "floor leader" of the Republican minority. When his own party was in power his advocacy of resumption and of tariff reform had prevented him from becoming chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Three of the papers read in this session were devoted to the consideration of fields of study and research still imperfectly cultivated. Prof. Arthur C. Cole, of the Ohio State University, discussed the application of the principles of historical criticism to newspapers and periodicals, and, since adequate direct use of these voluminous sources by the general historian has become a physical impossibility, urged the building up of systematic means for their intelligent use through the making of a large number of careful monographs on various phases and various examples of modern American journalism. Prof. Francis A. Christie, of the Meadville Theological School, treating of the field of religious development, set forth as the most conspicuous movement of the period the national organization, or

drawing together of loosely related churches, combined with a shifting of emphasis to ethical and philanthropic interests; hence such developments as the Christian Commission and Sanitary Commission of the Civil War, the conferences of the Evangelical Alliance, the Federal Union of the Churches of Christ, and the various interdenominational lay societies. Several of these deserve fuller study. Another factor was the development in the theological schools, with large consequences in clerical and other minds, of a scientific method for dealing with the data of religion. Fields awaiting full and dispassionate treatment are the progress of efforts toward social reform, the marked adaptation of Catholic churchmanship to the principles of American political life, and the vogue of a new conception of divine grace in the circle of Christian Science and New Thought. Miss Ella Lonn, of Goucher College, propounded a remarkably wide variety of questions calling for investigation in the political, financial, economic, social, and cultural history of the South after reconstruction, specifically of the years 1875-1890.

The papers read in the two joint sessions held with the Agricultural History Society happily combined the history of American agriculture with that of American social conditions. Thus, Prof. Archer B. Hulbert, of Colorado College, discoursing of the soil factor in Pennsylvania and Virginia colonization, showed how the abundant wheat crops of the Lancaster County region in Pennsylvania enabled that region to take the lead in furnishing the means of transportation—developing the Conestoga horse, the Conestoga wagon, the first turnpike, the first canal of any length—and, with these and its manufacture of firearms, in promoting the earlier waves of migration toward the West. Dr. Joseph Schafer, of the Wisconsin State Historical Society, showed how the Wisconsin Domesday Book, the plan of which is being prepared under his supervision, casts abundance of fresh light—the light of exact data in place of tradition—on the processes of pioneer settlement in one State at least, and illuminates the character of land speculation, the choices made of lands, the differing social result of settlement in forested and in prairie townships. In the paper by Prof. William W. Carson, of De Pauw University, on "Agricultural reconstruction in North Carolina after the Civil War," two matters were mainly discussed: the transition from wage labor, experimented with in the first few years after emancipation, to the system of cultivation on shares; and the westward extension of cotton cultivation, by means of fertilizers, and that of tobacco, of varieties suitable to lands hitherto considered too poor for that staple.

The other three papers in agricultural history looked rather at the political relations of agricultural industry and life. Prof. Theodore C. Blegen, of Hamline University, had as his theme "The

Scandinavian element and agrarian discontent." Sketching the early history of agricultural settlement on the part of the Scandinavians, and their relation to the Republican Party down to the nineties of the nineteenth century, he attributed their defections from that party, at that time and later, to the general agrarian movement, particularly the Farmers' Alliance and the Populists, and to the influx of immigrants unfamiliar with the Republican tradition. The Scandinavians have been influenced almost exclusively by economic and political, rather than by racial reasons; the habit of independent voting has continued. In quite another quarter, Prof. Melvin J. White, of Tulane University, traced the influence of agricultural conditions upon Louisiana State politics during the nineties, from the initial discontent of the small white farmer of the hill parishes, and his adhesion to the Farmers' Alliance and the People's Party, through the movements of fusion with the Republicans in 1892 and 1894, to the electoral reforms of 1896 or the constitutional convention of 1898, which redressed most of the grievances of which the People's Party had complained. The paper by Prof. Edward E. Dale, of the University of Oklahoma, on the cattle ranching industry in that State, was mainly concerned with governmental relations and with influences of the industry upon the development of the West and upon the country as a whole. He described with skill the rapid growth of the business, the extraordinary and spectacular developments which led to its downfall and to the opening of Oklahoma to agricultural settlement, and the incompetence of Congress and government to deal with a situation involving an industry so technical.

Very naturally and appropriately, one of the sessions was devoted to papers commemorating Missouri history. Mr. Frederick W. Lehmann, of the St. Louis bar, described the State constitution of 1820, the general course of legislation under it, and the experiences which led to extensive modifications of the governmental system in the constitution of 1875. Mr. Floyd C. Shoemaker, secretary of the State Historical Society of Missouri, set forth a variety of incorrect traditions concerning the Missouri Question and a variety of paradoxes in Missouri history, urging a closer and a broader study of its development.<sup>5</sup> Under the title, "A side light on the repeal of the Missouri compromise,"<sup>6</sup> Dr. H. Barrett Learned presented an investigation, based on contemporary newspapers and the papers of Philip Phillips, Member of Congress from Alabama at the time of the repeal, designed to show that Phillips's careful formulation of an amendment

<sup>5</sup> For these two papers, see the *Missouri Historical Review* for January, 1922

<sup>6</sup> Published in the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, March, 1922, XIII, 303-317, under title, *The Relation of Philip Phillips to the Report of the Missouri Compromise in 1854.*

to the Nebraska bill about January 19, 1854, probably influenced the ultimate form of that bill. Prof. William O. Lynch, of Indiana University, in a paper on "The influence of the movements of population on Missouri history before the Civil War," analyzed the population according to origins, period by period, and showed how ineffective relatively were the efforts of proslavery and antislavery partisans to direct immigration into Kansas at the height of the Kansas conflict; between 1850 and 1860 Tennessee contributed to Missouri eleven times the number of people that she furnished to Kansas, Kentucky five times the number, and even New England sent more settlers to Missouri. In 1860 Missouri ranked seventh in population among the Union States; she also ranked seventh in the number of soldiers sent to the Union armies.

Last of the sessions, and last to be here spoken of, was one held in concert with the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, of which the general theme was the economic history of the Mississippi Valley. Prof. Cardinal Goodwin, of Mills College, read a paper on "The fur trade and the Northwest boundary, 1783-1818," a topic closely allied to that of Professor Bemis's article.<sup>7</sup> Mrs. N. M. Miller Surrey, of New York, who on behalf of the Carnegie Institution of Washington is compiling the "Calendar of manuscripts in Paris archives relating to the Mississippi Valley," devised originally by a committee of the association, drew from her great repository of notes the materials for a paper on "The growth of industries in Louisiana, 1699-1763," full of new and detailed information, especially on the development of agricultural industries in that colony during the French period. For a later period, Prof. Albert L. Kohlmeier, of Indiana, showed the relations between commerce and Union sentiment in the Old Northwest in 1860, demonstrating how, despite the commercial attachments of the northern part of the region to the northeastern States and of the southern portion to those of the southeast, which caused discord and hesitation in 1860, conditions of greater force held the region to unity, and by the middle of 1861 gave Union sentiment an overwhelming majority.

It is difficult, perhaps it is unnecessary, to generalize respecting papers so numerous and so multifarious. Many contributed new matter or new points of view, some made little or no such contribution. There was a gratifying tendency, which we believe to be general in the historical profession since the war, to pursue subjects having real importance, episodes which have had significant consequences or aspects of history which the interests of the present day have made worth while, as distinguished from topics which are pursued because it has been the conventional habit of our guild to

---

<sup>7</sup> Amer. Hist. Rev., April, 1922.

pursue them, *idola tribus*, so to say. On the whole, it seems that most of the papers were good, but that few were of extraordinary excellence. Certainly few of the papers by Americans showed any of that gift of expression, those fruits of wide reading, which marked the papers of the two Frenchmen, and many were distinctly ill-written.

It remains to record the results of the business meeting of the association, at which the first vice president, Professor Haskins, presided. The secretary's report showed a total membership of 2,633, as compared with 2,524 reported a year ago, a gain of 109 members. The treasurer's report showed receipts of \$13,264, expenditures of \$12,584, but it is to be noted that the excess of receipts over expenditures, \$680, is almost entirely accounted for by the receipt of \$650 in life-membership fees, which by vote of the association are to be kept, as is proper in such cases, in a separate fund. Still further it is to be noted that \$2,904 of the receipts was derived from the voluntary contributions, additional to annual dues, which members have made in response to the invitations sent out in company with the annual bills. Therefore the need of a larger regular revenue remains apparent, and the constitutional amendment proposed last year, increasing annual dues from \$3 to \$5, and life-membership fees from \$50 to \$100, beginning with September 1 next, was voted without dissent. It is hoped and believed that the change, in which the association only follows at last a step which the analogous societies have already taken, will not cause the withdrawal of more than a very few, if any, of the members; and an increased revenue will enable the association to resume or promote activity along several lines of investigation or other work which in recent years its poverty has compelled it to suspend or renounce. Meanwhile, the large response to the suggestion of contributions has given most gratifying evidence of the interest which members have in the association and of their desire to sustain it effectively. The budget proposed by the council is printed on a later page.

The amendment to the by-laws, relative to discontinuance of the primary ballot for nominations to office and to membership in the nominating committee was rejected; it was voted that the portion of the by-laws referred to should be so interpreted as not to make the results of the preliminary ballot mandatory upon the committee on nominations, but merely an aid in the making of its recommendations.

It was voted, upon hospitable invitation from Yale University and upon recommendation from the council, that the annual meeting of December, 1922, should be held in New Haven. The council recommended that that meeting should begin not earlier than Wednesday morning, December 27, and should close not later than

Saturday noon, December 30. It was recommended that the meeting of December, 1923, be held in Columbus.

Reports from several committees were presented, and an oral report on behalf of the Pacific Coast Branch, by Prof. Robert C. Clark, its official representative on the present occasion. On report from the committee on the Herbert Baxter Adams prize, that prize was awarded to Dr. Einar Joranson, of the University of Chicago, for an essay on the Danegeld in France. This may be the best place in which to mention that the award of the Justin Winsor prize, delayed a year ago, was finally made to Mr. F. Lee Bennis, of the University of Indiana, for an essay on the American struggle for the British West Indian carrying trade, 1815-1830. A series of rules for the award of the George Louis Beer prize, for the "best work upon any phase of European international history since the year 1895," was proposed by the committee appointed a year before and adopted by the association. Copies can be obtained from the assistant secretary. A committee of five was appointed for award of the prize. The annual elections followed precisely the list presented by the committee on nominations. Prof. Charles H. Haskins was elected president for the ensuing year, Prof. Edward P. Cheyney first vice president, Hon. Woodrow Wilson second vice president. Prof. John S. Bassett and Mr. Charles Moore were reelected secretary and treasurer, respectively. The eight elective members of the executive council were all reelected, none of them having yet served the usual three years. For the committee on nominations to be presented next autumn the association chose Professors Henry E. Bourne, William E. Dodd, William E. Lingelbach, Nellie Neilson, and William L. Westermann; the committee has since chosen Professor Bourne as chairman. The council elected Prof. William E. Dodd a member of the board of editors of the *Review*, in the place of Professor Van Tyne, whose term had expired.

PROGRAM OF THE THIRTY-SIXTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE  
AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION, HELD AT ST. LOUIS, MO.,  
DECEMBER 27-30, 1921

*Tuesday, December 27*

7 p. m. SUBSCRIPTION DINNER OF THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION. St. Louis Club.

7.30 p. m. SUBSCRIPTION DINNER OF THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION. City Club, 911 Locust Street. Open to members of all the historical associations and to others interested in American history. Chairman, William E. Connelley, Kansas State Historical Society. The Mississippi Valley Historical Association: Its past and future; Clarence W. Alvord, University of Minnesota.

8 p. m. MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL. Planters Hotel.

*Wednesday, December 28*

10 a. m. CONFERENCE ON THE TEACHING OF HISTORY IN SCHOOLS. Assembly Room, Chamber of Commerce. Chairman, Daniel C. Knowlton, Lincoln School, New York City. Desirable adjustments between history and the other social sciences: Rolla M. Tryon, University of Chicago; E. M. Violette, State Teachers College, Kirksville, Mo. Discussion: A. C. Krey, University of Minnesota; Frederic L. Paxson, University of Wisconsin; Bessie L. Pierce, State University of Iowa; Louise Irby, North Carolina State College for Women.

10 a. m. MEDIEVAL HISTORY. St. Louis Court of Appeals, Pierce Building. Chairman, Laurence M. Larson, University of Illinois. Guido Bonatti, an astrologer of the thirteenth century mentioned by Dante: Lynn Thorndike, Western Reserve University. The international state of the Middle Ages—some causes for its downfall: A. C. Krey, University of Minnesota. The twelfth and thirteenth centuries in the history of culture: Louis J. Paetow, University of California. Discussion: Frederic Duncalf, University of Texas; E. F. Seybolt, University of Illinois; James F. Willard, University of Colorado; J. E. Wrench, University of Missouri.

10 a. m. CONFERENCE OF ARCHIVISTS. Assembly room, St. Louis Public Library. Chairman, Solon J. Buck, Minnesota Historical Society. How can the States be persuaded to take care of their historical archives?: Lessons from North Carolina, R. D. W. Connor, University of North Carolina; Lessons from Iowa, C. C. Stiles, Iowa State Department of History; Lessons from Connecticut, George S. Godard, Connecticut State Library. Discussion led by John W. Oliver, Indiana Historical Commission.

The future of the Public Archives Commission: The achievements and possibilities of the Commission. Victor H. Paltsits, chairman of the Commission. Discussion led by J. Franklin Jameson, Carnegie Institution, Washington.

Victor H. Paltsits, chairman of the Commission. Discussion led by J. Franklin Jameson, Carnegie Institution, Washington.

10 a. m. AGRICULTURAL HISTORY. Joint conference with the Agricultural History Society. Art League Room, Planters Hotel. Chairman, Lyman Carrier, United States Department of Agriculture. The Norwegian element and

agrarian discontent; Theodore C. Blegen, Hamline University. The Wisconsin Domesday Book in agricultural history; Joseph Schafer, Wisconsin State Historical Society. History of the livestock industry in Oklahoma; Edward E. Dale, University of Oklahoma.

12.15 p. m. LUNCHEON CONFERENCE ON THE HISTORY OF SCIENCE. American Hotel Annex. Chairman, Lynn Thorndike, Western Reserve University. Opportunities for research in the history of science in European libraries; Charles H. Haskins, Harvard University. American history and the natural sciences; Archer B. Hulbert, Colorado College. Informal discussion on opportunities for research, and on the relations of the American Historical Association and the American Association for the Advancement of Science in promoting the study of the history of science.

12.15 p. m. LUNCHEON CONFERENCE ON THE HISTORY OF THE WAR. Banquet Hall, American Hotel Annex. Chairman, Frank M. Anderson, Dartmouth College. Critical problems involved in the use of the official records of the World War; Wayne E. Stevens, Dartmouth College. The contribution to the history of the World War of a group of officers of the A. E. F.; Shipley Thomas, New York City. Informal discussion on the general subject, opened by Carlton J. H. Hayes, Columbia University.

12.15 p. m. LUNCHEON CONFERENCE ON AMERICAN COLONIAL HISTORY. Main dining room, American Hotel Annex. Chairman, Verner W. Crane, Brown University. Discussion opened by B. W. Bond, jr., University of Cincinnati; W. T. Root, University of Wisconsin; L. H. Gipson, Wabash College; M. W. Jernegan, University of Chicago.

2.30 p. m. AGRICULTURAL HISTORY SOCIETY. Art League room, Planters' Hotel. Chairman, Herbert A. Kellar, McCormick Library, Chicago, Ill. The influence of agricultural conditions upon Louisiana State politics during the nineties: Melvin J. White, Tulane University. Agricultural reconstruction in North Carolina after the Civil War: Wallace W. Carson, De Pauw University. The soil factor in Pennsylvania and Virginia colonization: Archer B. Hulbert, Colorado College.

3 p. m. GENERAL SESSION ON THE HISTORY OF FRANCE. Assembly room, Chamber of Commerce. Chairman, the president of the association. Town privileges under the "Etablissements" of Rouen: Earle W. Dow, University of Michigan. Voltaire's philosophy of history: Albert F. Guérard, Rice Institute, Houston, Tex. Significance of the French Revolution: Fred M. Fling, University of Nebraska. The Revolutionary philosophy in France and in the United States at the end of the eighteenth century: Bernard Fay, Paris, France. The part France has played in liberating other nations: Charles D. Hazen, Columbia University.

7 p. m. BANQUET FOR MEMBERS OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION AND THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION given by the Trustees of the Missouri Botanical Garden at the Hotel Jefferson. Address of welcome, Chancellor Frederic A. Hall, Washington University. Presidential address: The rearing of ambassadors, Jean Jules Jusserand, ambassador of the French Republic, president of the American Historical Association.

*Thursday, December 29*

10. a. m. THE HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION. Old Chapel, University Hall, Washington University. Chairman, James A. James, Northwestern University. A survey of the historiography of the American Revolution for the past 20 years: C. H. Van Tyne, University of Michigan. In re the American

People v. George III: Clarence W. Alvord, University of Minnesota. Discussion: A. C. McLaughlin, University of Chicago; Carl Becker, Cornell University; A. M. Schlesinger, Iowa State University; Samuel E. Morison, Harvard University.

10 a. m. THE HISTORY OF CIVILIZATION. Graham Memorial Chapel, Washington University. Chairman, James Henry Breasted, University of Chicago. New light on the origins of civilization: the chairman of the conference. Art and architecture: Ferdinand Schevill, University of Chicago. Warfare: Brig. Gen. Eben Swift, United States Army, retired. Commerce and economics: William L. Westermann, Cornell University. The task of the historian in the light of the recent reassessment of human nature: James Harvey Robinson, New School for Social Research, New York City. Informal discussion.

12.30 p. m. COMPLIMENTARY LUNCHEON FOR ALL MEMBERS OF THE ASSOCIATION. Francis Gymnasium, Washington University. Chairman, Otto Heller, Washington University. Speakers: John Spencer Bassett, Smith College; Herbert E. Bolton, University of California.

2.30 p. m. MILITARY HISTORY. Assembly Room, Jefferson Memorial. Chairman, Col. C. H. Lanza, United States Army. Causes of the European War: Col. C. H. Howland, United States Army. The Thirty-fifth Division on September 29, 1918: Col. C. H. Lanza, United States Army. Discussion.

2.30 p. m. CONFERENCE OF HISTORICAL SOCIETIES. G. A. R. Room, Jefferson Memorial. Chairman, George S. Godard, Connecticut State Library. Secretary, John C. Parish, Iowa State University. The future of the State Historical Society: Benjamin E. Shambaugh, State Historical Society of Iowa. Historical material in Washington of value to the State: Newton D. Mereness, Washington, D. C. Historical materials in the depositories of the Middle West: Theodore C. Pease, Illinois State Historical Library. Discussion.

2.30 p. m. PROBLEMS OF ECONOMIC HISTORY. Jefferson Hall, Jefferson Memorial. The development of metropolitan economy in Europe and America: N. S. B. Gras, University of Minnesota. Discussion: Mildred E. Hartsough, University of Minnesota; R. J. Kerner, University of Missouri; Guernsey Jones, University of Nebraska. The significance of sociology for economic and social history: Harry E. Barnes, Clark University. Discussion: J. Fred Rippey, University of Chicago; M. S. Handman, University of Texas; W. B. Bodenhafer, Washington University; J. E. Gillespie, University of Illinois.

6 p. m. DINNER CONFERENCE OF PATRIOTIC SOCIETIES. American Hotel Annex. Chairman, Dixon R. Fox, Columbia University.

6 p. m. DINNER CONFERENCE OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE WAR HISTORY ORGANIZATIONS. Main dining room, American Hotel Annex. Chairman, James Sullivan, University of the State of New York.

8 p. m. GENERAL SESSION COMMEMORATING THE CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF THE ADMISSION OF MISSOURI TO THE UNION. City Club. Chairman, Andrew C. McLaughlin, University of Chicago. The first constitution of Missouri: Frederick W. Lehmann, St. Louis. Traditions concerning the Missouri question: Floyd C. Shoemaker, Missouri Historical Society. A side-light on the repeal of the Missouri Compromise: H. Barrett Learned, Washington, D. C. The influence of the movements of population on Missouri history before the Civil War: William O. Lynch, Indiana University.

10 p. m. SMOKER FOR MEN AND RECEPTION FOR LADIES given by the Missouri Historical Society, City Club.

*Friday, December 30*

10 a. m. ANCIENT HISTORY: THE ROMAN EMPIRE. St. Louis Court of Appeals, Pierce Building. Chairman, M. I. Rostovtzeff, University of Wisconsin. Recent advances in our knowledge of the Roman Empire: General survey; A. E. R. Boak, University of Michigan. The Empire as a continuation of the Republic; Frank B. Marsh, University of Texas. Greco-Roman religion; Carl F. Huth, University of Chicago. New evidence from the papyri; Charles H. Oldfather, Wabash College. Light from the East; A. T. Olmstead, University of Illinois. General discussion.

10 a. m. MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY: EUROPE AFTER THE CONGRESS OF VIENNA. Ball Room, Planters Hotel. Chairman, Sidney B. Fay, Smith College. A criticism of the Italian settlement of 1815; William A. Frayer, University of Michigan. Nationalism and the Metternich system; Robert J. Kerner, University of Missouri. British jealousy of French imperialism after 1815; Parker T. Moon, Columbia University. The July days and after; J. M. S. Allison, Yale University. Discussion: H. R. Shipman, Princeton University; Carlton J. H. Hayes, Columbia University; Bernadotte Schmidt, Western Reserve University; Laurence B. Packard, Rochester University.

10 a. m. RECENT HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES: THE STUDY OF THE GENERATION FOLLOWING THE CIVIL WAR. Assembly Room, Chamber of Commerce. Chairman, Frederic L. Paxson, University of Wisconsin. The emergence of the problems of the period out of war and reconstruction; Paul L. Haworth, West Newton, Ind. Light on the period from the Garfield papers; Theodore C. Smith, Williams College. Fields for study and research: The use of the newspaper and periodical sources; Arthur C. Cole, Ohio State University. The field of religious development; Francis A. Christie, Meadville Theological Seminary. The South after reconstruction; Ella Lonn, Goucher College. Discussion: Charles W. Ramsdell, University of Texas; Louis Pelzer, State University of Iowa; Charles R. Lingley, Dartmouth College.

12.30 p. m. LUNCHEON CONFERENCE ON THE HISTORY OF THE FAR EAST. American Hotel Annex. Chairman, K. S. Latourette, Yale University. Prince Shotoku and the Taikwa reform in Japan in 645 A. D.; Langdon Warner, director, Pennsylvania Museum, Philadelphia. The present state of Chinese research in the United States; Berthold Laufer, Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago. Discussion: Informal discussion of possible college course in this field, opened by the chairman.

12.30 p. m. LUNCHEON CONFERENCE ON HISPANIC-AMERICAN HISTORY. Banquet Hall, American Hotel Annex. Chairman, Herbert I. Priestley, University of California. Materials for Spanish history in the Genaro Garcia Library; Charles W. Hackett, University of Texas. The establishment of the Vice-Royalty in the New World—a projection of Spanish institutions; Arthur S. Aiton, University of Michigan. The policy of Spain toward her revolted colonies in 1823-1824; William S. Robertson, University of Illinois. Some reflections on the Cabildo; William W. Pierson, jr., University of North Carolina. Discussion.

12.30 p. m. LUNCHEON CONFERENCE ON ENGLISH HISTORY. Main dining room, American Hotel Annex. Chairman, Norman M. Trenholme, University of Missouri. Recent history tendencies and a suggestion; Arthur Lyon Cross, University of Michigan. Electioneering in the time of Sir Robert Walpole; Clarence Perkins, University of North Dakota. The study of English legal history; C. C. Crawford, University of Kansas.

3.30 p. m. ANNUAL BUSINESS MEETING OF THE ASSOCIATION. Ball Room, Planters Hotel. Reports of officers and committees, election of officers, announcement of committee appointments, miscellaneous business.

8 p. m. JOINT SESSION WITH THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION. THE ECONOMIC HISTORY OF THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY. Ball Room, Planters Hotel. Chairman, Joseph Schafer, State Historical Society of Wisconsin. Growth of industries in Louisiana, 1699-1763; Mrs. N. M. Miller Surrey, New York City. The fur trade and the Northwest Boundary, 1783-1818; Cardinal Goodwin, Mills College. Federal policy and the fur trade; Lester B. Shippee, University of Minnesota. Commerce and Union sentiment in the Old Northwest in 1860; Albert L. Kohlmeier, Indiana University.

# MINUTES OF THE ANNUAL BUSINESS MEETING OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION, HELD AT THE PLANTERS HOTEL, ST. LOUIS, MO., DECEMBER 30, 1921

The meeting was called to order at 3.45 p. m., Mr. Haskins, first vice president, presiding.

The report of the secretary was read, received, and placed on file.

The report of the treasurer was presented. The Chair appointed Mr. G. S. Ford and Mr. F. M. Anderson an auditing committee to inspect the report of the treasurer before final adoption. The committee reported that it found the treasurer's report correct, and it was voted that it be accepted.

It was voted to adopt the budget as recommended by the council.

The secretary reported that the council recommended that the next meeting of the association be held in New Haven in 1922, with the expectation that the meeting in 1923 should be in Columbus, Ohio. The recommendation was approved.

It was voted to adopt the recommendations of the special committee to formulate rules governing competition for the George Louis Deer prize.

Mr. R. C. Clark presented an informal report for the Pacific Coast Branch.

After discussion it was unanimously voted to adopt the following amendment to the constitution, offered by Mr. George L. Burr at the last annual meeting:

That in Article III there be substituted for "\$3" "\$5," and for "\$50" "\$100," so that the article shall read:

"Any person approved by the executive council may become a member by paying \$5, and after the first year may continue a member by paying an annual fee of \$5. On payment of \$100 any person may become a life member, exempt from fees. Persons not resident in the United States may be elected as honorary or corresponding members and be exempt from the payment of fees."

In response to an inquiry from the floor, the chair announced that unless there was contrary opinion on the part of the members present, he should rule that the amendment just adopted should become effective September 1, 1922, the beginning of the next fiscal year.

The chair called for action on the following amendment to the by-laws, offered by Mr. Paltsits at the last annual business meeting:

The word "nomination," line 1, be changed to "nominating," and the sentence beginning "at such," line 3, and ending "be chosen," line 7, be omitted. Change "one day," line 14, to "two days;" so that by-law II will read as follows:

"A nominating committee of five members shall be chosen at each annual business meeting in the manner hereafter provided for the election of officers

of the association. It shall publish and mail to each member at least one month prior to the annual business meeting such nominations as it may determine upon for each elective office and for the next nominating committee. It shall prepare for use at the annual business meeting an official ballot containing, as candidates for each office or committee membership to be filled thereat, the names of its nominees and also the names of any other nominees which may be proposed to the chairman of the committee in writing by 20 or more members of the association at least two days before the annual business meeting; but such nominations by petition shall not be presented until after the committee shall have reported its nominations to the association as provided for in the present by-law. The official ballot shall also provide, under each office, a blank space for voting for such further nominees as any member may present from the floor at the time of the election.

After discussion, participated in by Messrs. Paltsits, Sullivan, Anderson, Paxson, Cox, and McLaughlin, the motion was put on the adoption of the amendment and carried in the negative.

Mr. A. C. McLaughlin moved that by-law II be so interpreted as not to make the results of the primary ballot mandatory on the nominating committee, and that this interpretation be placed in the minutes as expressing the opinion of the association. The motion was adopted.

Mr. H. B. Learned, chairman, reported for the committee on publications.

The secretary reported for the committee on the Herbert Baxter Adams prize that the prize had been awarded to Mr. Einar Joranson for an essay entitled "The Danegeld in France."

It was reported that the Justin Winsor prize for 1920 was awarded to F. Lee Bennis for his essay entitled "The American struggle for the British West India carrying trade, 1815-1830."

The secretary reported from the council the following appointments to committees:

#### STANDING COMMITTEES

[New members in italics]

*Committee on program for the thirty-seventh annual meeting.*—David S. Muzzey, chairman (term expires in 1922); Wilbur H. Siebert (1922), *Eloise Ellery* (1924). (The other members of the committee are: Charles Seymour, appointed in 1920 for the term expiring in 1922; Walter L. Fleming, appointed in 1920 for the term expiring in 1923; and ex officio, Nils Andreas Olsen, secretary of the Agricultural History Society, and John C. Parish, secretary of the Conference of Historical Societies.)

*Committee on local arrangements, thirty-seventh annual meeting.*—Max Farrand, chairman.

*Board of editors of the American Historical Review.*—William B. Dodd (to serve six years from January 1, 1922).

*Historical Manuscripts Commission.*—Justin H. Smith, chairman; Annie H. Abel, Eugene C. Barker, Robert P. Brooks, Logan Esarey, Gaillard Hunt.

*Committee on the Justin Winsor prize.*—Isaac J. Cox, chairman; C. S. Boucher, Thomas F. Moran, Bernard C. Steiner, C. Mildred Thompson.

*Committee on the Herbert Baxter Adams prize.*—Conyers Read, chairman; Charles H. McIlwain, Nellie Neilson, *Louis J. Pactow*, Bernadotte E. Schmitt, Wilbur H. Siebert.

*Committee on publications* (all ex officio except the chairman).—H. Barrett Learned, chairman; Allen R. Boyd, secretary; John S. Bassett, J. Franklin Jameson, Justin H. Smith, Herbert A. Kellar.

*Committee on membership.*—Louise Fargo Brown, chairman; *Elizabeth Donnan*, A. C. Krey, Frank E. Melvin, Richard A. Newhall, *John W. Oliver*,

Charles W. Ramsdell, Arthur P. Scott, J. J. Van Nostrand, jr., James E. Winston.

*Conference of historical societies.*—John C. Parish, secretary.

*Committee on national archives.*—J. Franklin Jameson, chairman; *Gaillard Hunt*, Charles Moore, *Eben Putnam*, Col. Oliver L. Spaulding, jr.

*Committee on bibliography.*—George M. Dutcher, chairman; Henry R. Shipman, acting chairman; William H. Allison, Sidney B. Fay, Augustus H. Shearer.

*Subcommittee on the bibliography of American travel.*—Solon J. Buck, Homer C. Hockett, M. M. Quaife.

*Public archives commission.*—Victor H. Paltsits, chairman; Solon J. Buck, *John H. Edmonds*, Robert Burton House, Waldo G. Leland.

*Committee on obtaining transcripts from foreign archives.*—Charles M. Andrews, chairman; *Gaillard Hunt*, Waldo G. Leland.

*Committee on military history.*—Brig. Gen. Eben Swift, chairman; Allen R. Boyd, *Thomas R. Hay*, Eben Putnam, Col. Oliver L. Spaulding, jr., *Lieut. Col. Jennings C. Wise*.

*Committee on hereditary patriotic societies.*—Dixon R. Fox, chairman; Natalie S. Lincoln, Harry Brent Mackoy, Mrs. Annie L. Sioussat, R. C. Ballard Thurston.

*Committee on service.*—J. Franklin Jameson, chairman; Elbert J. Benton, Clarence S. Brigham, Worthington C. Ford, *Stella Herron*, *Theodore D. Jervay*, *Louise Phelps Kellogg*, Albert E. McKinley, *Herbert I. Priestley*, James Sullivan.

*Board of editors of the Historical Outlook.*—Edgar Dawson, Sarah A. Dynes, Daniel C. Knowlton, Laurence M. Larson, William L. Westermann.

*Committee on historical research in colleges.*—William K. Boyd, chairman; E. Merton Coulter, Benjamin B. Kendrick, Asa E. Martin, William W. Sweet.

*Committee on the George L. Beer prize.*—Bernadotte E. Schmitt, chairman; George H. Blakeslee, Robert H. Lord, Jesse S. Reeves, Mason W. Tyler.

*Committee on history teaching in the schools.*—Guy Stanton Ford, chairman; Henry E. Bourne, Philip P. Chase, Henry Johnson, Daniel C. Knowlton, Albert E. McKinley, *Arthur M. Schlesinger*, Eugene M. Violette.

*Representatives in National Council of Teachers of Social Studies.*—Henry Johnson, *Arthur M. Schlesinger*.

*Delegate in the American Council of Learned Societies.*—Charles H. Haskins (term expires in 1923).

*Committee on endowment.*—Charles Moore, chairman.

#### SPECIAL COMMITTEES

*Committee on bibliography of modern English history.*—Edward P. Cheyney, chairman; Arthur L. Cross, Roger B. Merriman, Wallace Notestein, Conyers Read.

*Committee on the historical congress at Rio de Janeiro.*—John B. Stetson, jr., chairman; Percy A. Martin, vice chairman; James A. Robertson, secretary; Charles Lyon Chandler, *Isaac J. Coz*, Charles H. Cunningham, Julius Klein, Manoel de Oliveira Lima, Edwin V. Morgan, Constantine E. McGuire, William S. Schurz.

*Committee on the documentary historical publications of the United States.*—J. Franklin Jameson, chairman; Charles Moore.

*Committee on the writing of history.*—Ambassador Jean Jules Jusserand, chairman; John S. Bassett, secretary; Wilbur C. Abbott, Charles W. Colby.

*Committee to cooperate with The Peoples of America Society in the study of race elements in the United States.*—John S. Bassett, chairman; Frederic L. Paxson.

The report of the committee on nominations was presented. No other nominations were made and it was voted unanimously that the secretary be instructed to cast the ballot of the association for the candidates nominated by the committee.

This was done and the following elections were duly declared:

President, Charles H. Haskins.

First vice president, Edward P. Cheyney.

Second vice president, Woodrow Wilson.

Secretary, John Spencer Bassett.

Treasurer, Charles Moore.

Executive council: Arthur L. Cross, Sidney B. Fay, Carl Russell Fish, Carlton J. H. Hayes, Frederic L. Paxson, Ruth Putnam, James T. Shotwell, St. George L. Sioussat.

Committee on nominations: Henry E. Bourne, William E. Dodd, William E. Lingelbach, Nellie Neilson, William L. Westermann.

Mr. Haskins called Mr. Moore to the chair.

It was voted to instruct the secretary to extend the thanks of the association to the trustees of the Missouri Botanical Garden, the chancellor of Washington University, the trustees of the Missouri Historical Society, the committee on local arrangements, and the program committee, and the other similar organizations whose courtesy and assistance in behalf of the association during the annual meeting have promoted the success and pleasure of the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 5.15 p. m.

#### REPORT OF THE SECRETARY

The year just ending is characterized by quiet growth in the life of the association. No striking events have occurred, but its activities are sound and widespread. It is carrying out in a safe and extended way the work the association was created to perform, the promotion of the study of history in all its proper phases. The necessary interruption caused by the World War has been passed and the organization has returned to its normal task, the service of humanity through the development of history.

During the year the secretary spent eight weeks during the summer and the early autumn in Washington without expense to the association. He was thus enabled to avail himself again of the assistance of Miss Washington, the efficient assistant secretary, and Mr. Leland, the former secretary. One result of this experience was to impress again on his mind the large amount of information about the activities and purposes of the association that lies hidden in its records, information that only time and study can reveal. In this connection I venture to suggest that you consider the preparation of a brief historical sketch and functional exposition of the life of the association. Such a sketch would make the association more real than it is now to our widely scattered members and prevent some misunderstandings that arise from not knowing what the association is doing. If it is prepared it should be accompanied by a code of the rules and regulations of the association.

*The committee on agenda.*—This committee held its first meeting in New York on November 26, 1921. Through the courtesy of the Columbia University Club of New York it assembled under very comfortable circumstances. The members who attended were Messrs. Cheyney, Cross, Fay, Haskins, Hayes, Moore, Paxson, and Bassett. Its report is now before you. Some of the business that was presented was of such a nature that it seemed possible to take final action on it subject to the approval of the council. Matters of this

nature have been assembled in Part I of the report. All such matters as seemed to the committee to require further consideration before the council are presented to you in Part II. The committee voted to request the council to interpret the council vote of last December whereby the treasurer was authorized to pay the traveling expenses of the members of this committee to attend one meeting. It wishes to know if it was intended that hotel bills should be included in the term "traveling expenses."

*Membership.*—December 15, 1921, the association had 2,633 members, of which 2,286 were annual members, 116 life members, and 231 institutional members. The total paid members, including life members, were 2,106. The delinquents for one year were 25, and those delinquent since the last bill was sent out were 502. During the year the association lost 219 members, of which 29 were through death, 67 through resignation, 123 through the application of the rule requiring the dropping of delinquents. In the same period the association gained 328 new members, of whom 309 were annual, 4 life, and 15 institutional members. Thus the net gain in membership was 109.

Comparing these statistics with the statistics for the preceding five years it is seen that in 1917 the total membership was 2,654, in 1918 it was 2,519, in 1919 it was 2,445, in 1920 it was 2,524, and in 1921 it is 2,633. For these years the item of loss and gain in membership stands: For 1917 a loss of 85, for 1918 a loss of 135, for 1919 a loss of 74, for 1920 a gain of 79, and for 1921 a gain of 109. For this improvement in the membership of the association credit is largely due to the efforts of the committee on membership, which for two years has been under the able direction of Professor Wertenbaker. It is a cause of regret that he feels that he can not hold the chairmanship longer. If the council accepts his resignation it would be a graceful and just thing to do to pass a vote of thanks for his efforts in the position from which he will retire.

A detailed analysis of membership has been made out by Miss Washington and is open for inspection. It shows that during the past year the largest proportional gain in membership in the United States has been made in the South Atlantic States, while the next largest gain has been made in the North Atlantic States. There has been a net loss in the New England and the South Central States. In 1917 the total membership was 2,654 and at this time it is 2,633, which shows that it has about got back where it was five years ago. Examining the regional statistics for these two years, we find a loss of 58 in the New England States, 12 in the North Central States, 18 in the South Central States, 16 in the Pacific Coast States. On the other hand, we find a gain of 26 in the North Atlantic States, 10 in the South Atlantic States, 37 in the West Central States, 2 in the Territories, and 8 in other countries.

Too much emphasis can not be laid upon the work of the committee on membership. On its success depends the growth of the association. Reference to the list of committees will show to what extent the committee on membership has drawn upon the aid of other members of the association in appointing associate members. The duty of these members lies in becoming responsible for the discovery and nomination of worthy members of the association in assigned regions.

*Deceased members.*—The following members have died during the year:

James Phinney Baxter, Portland, Me.

Melville M. Bigelow (life member), Boston.

W. F. Bliss, San Diego, Calif.

Charles Joseph Bonaparte, Baltimore.

Albert A. Cain, Cambridge, Ohio.

Ellen Scott Davison, Cambridge, Mass.  
Rev. Edward I. Devitt, Washington.  
Charles A. Green, Brooklyn, N. Y.  
George Bates Hopkins (life member), New York.  
George S. Hosmer, Detroit, Mich.  
John Woolf Jordan, Philadelphia.  
Mrs. Kathryn Leitch, Van Nuys, Calif.  
Charles McCarthy, Madison, Wis.  
Harry Albert McGill, Poplar Bluff, Mo.  
John Winthrop Platner, Cambridge, Mass.  
M. Taylor Pyne, Princeton, N. J.  
Reinhardt Rahr, Manitowoc, Wis.  
Joseph G. Rosengarten, Philadelphia.  
Richard Cutts Shannon, Brockport, N. Y.  
Oliver W. Shaw, Austin, Minn.  
Allen C. Thomas (founder), Haverford, Pa.  
William J. Trimble, Moscow, Idaho.  
Stephen M. Weld, Wareham, Mass.  
Barrett Wendell, Boston.  
George Peabody Wetmore (life member), Newport, R. I.  
Samuel H. Wheeler, Bridgeport, Conn.  
Cornelia d'Auby Williams, Utica, N. Y.  
Thomas Hunter Wilson, Cleveland, Ohio.

*A publication fund.*—One of the normal functions of an organization like ours is to publish works of history and works that contain the materials for use by historians. By a rule of the authorities of the Smithsonian Institution some of our own papers from the program of the annual meeting are ruled out of the annual report. Others are ruled out by necessity. Lack of funds has made it advisable to discontinue the publication of the prize essays. From Mr. Conyers Read, chairman of the Herbert Baxter Adams prize committee, comes the sensible complaint that little interest exists in the competition since this rule has been made. My own reflection on this situation is that there should be funds enough to do what publishing we think essential to our progress and best usefulness. An association as strong as this should be able to collect a publication fund that is adequate. Much smaller societies have done as much. I do not think we can afford to delay longer in the long-deferred plan of organizing efforts to create an adequate endowment fund for the publication of such material as we deem wise.

In the same connection it seems the duty of the association to make its prizes for historical works in keeping with the dignity of the association. It is logical for this association to offer the most valued prizes for historical competition in this nation. Two other organizations, one a school of journalism and the other a religious organization, have taken the honor out of our hands. The situation that results should not be suffered to continue. To change it should be the subject of our careful consideration. It seems to me that the association would lose something that it has held from the beginning if the public were to come to think that it no longer stands as the chief sponsor of the historical spirit in the United States.

Respectfully submitted.

JOHN SPENCER BASSETT, *Secretary.*

## REPORT OF THE TREASURER

*Comparative financial statement for the fiscal years 1921 and 1920*

## INCOME

	1921	1920
From members, annual dues .....	\$7,059.71	\$6,990.27
From members, contributions .....	2,903.75	1,652.60
American Historical Review, contribution .....	500.00	
	\$10,463.46	\$8,642.87
Endowment fund, interest .....	1,368.51	1,330.21
Bank balances, interest .....	67.44	39.64
	1,435.95	1,369.85
Royalties .....	72.49	49.70
Publications sold:		
Prize essays .....	213.53	60.23
Papers and reports .....	97.71	24.40
Writings on American history .....	20.20	12.75
Directory .....	5.00	13.95
	336.44	111.33
Registration fees .....	54.25	107.87
Miscellaneous .....	159.91	51.50
	12,522.50	10,333.12
Cash balance Dec. 1 .....	3,881.16	5,084.72
Total .....	16,403.66	15,417.84

## DISBURSEMENTS

Office of secretary and treasurer .....	\$2,928.77	\$2,754.43
Pacific Coast Branch .....	43.89	45.05
London headquarters .....		31.45
	\$2,972.63	\$2,830.9
Committees of management:		
On nominations .....	46.93	103.00
On membership .....	23.85	71.35
On program .....	383.15	259.80
On local arrangements .....	203.30	50.00
On policy .....	39.75	133.68
On agenda .....	75.03	
	772.01	617.33
Historical activities:		
Committee on bibliography .....	295.39	
Committee on publications .....	677.29	674.37
Committee on history and education .....	300.00	
Conference of historical societies .....	25.00	23.15
Historical Manuscripts Commission .....		20.00
Writings on American history .....	200.00	200.00
American Council of Learned Societies .....	153.89	122.85
American Council on Education .....		10.00
	1,651.57	1,050.3
Prizes:		
Herbert Baxter Adams prize, for W. T. Morgan "English political parties and leaders in the reign of Queen Anne" .....		200.00
Robert M. Johnston prize, for T. R. Hay, "Hood's Tennessee campaign" .....	250.00	
American Historical Review .....	7,040.90	5,087.85
	12,087.11	9,786.48
Cash advances (endowment fund) .....	1,119.12	
	13,806.23	9,786.48
Total receipts .....	23,398.19	16,667.84
Total disbursements .....	20,800.76	11,636.68
Bank balance December 1 .....	2,597.43	5,031.16

## ENDOWMENT FUND, 1921

## Receipts:

Transferred from Central Trust Co. of New York .....	\$188.91
George L. Beer prize bequest .....	5,000.00
Andrew D. White fund (cash on hand) .....	1,000.00
Andrew D. White fund (royalties) .....	5.62
Life memberships .....	650.00
Cash balance Dec. 1, 1920 .....	150.00
	\$6,994.53
Cash advances .....	1,119.12
	8,113.65

## Purchased for:

## The endowment fund:

7 per cent Pennsylvania Railroad bonds, 1930, at 105½, (\$2,000)—		
Cost of bonds	-----	\$2, 110. 00
Accrued interest to date of purchase	-----	12. 44
Commission	-----	3. 00
		<u>\$2, 125. 44</u>

## The George L. Beer prize fund:

7 per cent Pennsylvania Railroad bonds, 1930, at 106½ (\$2,000)—		
Cost of bonds	-----	2, 130. 00
Accrued interest to date of purchase	-----	14. 00
Commission	-----	3. 00
		<u>2, 147. 00</u>

4¼ per cent Liberty bonds, 1938 (\$3,000)—		
Cost of bonds	-----	2, 793. 60
Accrued interest to date of purchase	-----	6. 38
Commission	-----	3. 75
		<u>2, 803. 73</u>

## The Andrew D. White fund:

4¼ per cent Liberty bonds, 1947 (\$1,200)—		
Cost of bonds	-----	1, 034. 48
Commission	-----	3. 00
		<u>1, 037. 48</u>
		<u>\$8, 113. 65</u>

## ENDOWMENT FUND

*Principal account*

## Unrestricted (including Herbert Baxter Adams bequest, 1902, \$4,875):

## 4¼ per cent Liberty bonds—

1928—	Cost	
Two at \$1,000	-----	\$2, 000. 00 2, 000. 00
Four at \$100	-----	400. 00 400. 00
One at \$50	-----	50. 00 50. 00
1933-1938—		
One at \$5,000	-----	4, 697. 25 5, 000. 00
One at \$500	-----	500. 00 500. 00
Three at \$100	-----	300. 00 300. 00
1927-1942—		
Two at \$10,000	-----	18, 928. 50 20, 000. 00
One at \$1,000	-----	948. 00 1, 000. 00
Two at \$1,000	-----	1, 835. 80 2, 000. 00
Two at \$100	-----	180. 05 200. 00

7 per cent Pennsylvania Railroad bonds, 1930 (two at \$1,000)	-----	2, 113. 00 2, 000. 00
---	-------	-----------------------

George L. Beer prize fund:<sup>1</sup> \$33, 450. 00

4¼ per cent Liberty bonds, 1938, three at \$1,000	-----	2, 797. 35 3, 000. 00
---	-------	-----------------------

7 per cent Pennsylvania Railroad bonds, 1930, two at \$1,000	-----	2, 133. 00 2, 000. 00
--	-------	-----------------------

Andrew D. White fund:<sup>2</sup>

4¼ per cent Liberty bonds, 1947—		
One at \$1, 000	-----	864. 40 1, 000. 00
Two at \$100	-----	173. 08 200. 00
		<u>1, 200. 00</u>

39, 650. 00

<sup>1</sup> Bequest of George L. Beer, 1919, to establish an annual prize for an essay on the history of European international relations since 1895.

<sup>2</sup> Gift of National Board for Historical Service for participation in the activities of the American Council of Learned Societies.

*American Historical Review*

	Cost	
4¼ per cent Liberty bonds, 1933-1938:		
One at \$1,000-----	\$945.40	\$1,000.00
Two at \$100-----	189.24	200.00
		<u>\$1,200.00</u>

## AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW

*Statement for year ending November 30, 1921*

## Receipts:

Macmillan Co., for editorial expenses, as per contract-----	\$2,400.00	
Interest on investments-----	51.00	
Interest on bank account-----	22.73	
		<u>\$2,473.73</u>
Cash balance, Dec. 1, 1920-----		1,321.40
Total receipts-----		<u><u>3,795.13</u></u>

## Disbursements:

Petty cash-----	\$172.46	
Printing, stationery, supplies-----	33.99	
Binding-----	34.00	
Publications-----	12.00	
Transcription of documents-----	59.22	
Travel-----	262.64	
Payments to contributors to Review—		
January, 1921, number-----	409.25	
April, 1921, number-----	423.75	
July, 1921, number-----	460.75	
October, 1921, number-----	388.25	
Additional payment to the Macmillan Co. of 15 cents per copy on account of October, 1920, number of the Review sent to members of the American Historical Association-----	381.45	
Payment to the American Historical Association, in accordance with vote of the board of editors, May 28, 1921-----	500.00	
		<u>3,137.76</u>
Cash balance, Nov. 30, 1921-----		657.37
		<u><u>3,795.13</u></u>

## Investments:

4¼ per cent Liberty bonds, 1933-1938—	Cost.	
One at \$1,000-----	\$945.40	\$1,000.00
Two at \$100-----	189.24	200.00
		<u>1,200.00</u>

CHARLES MOORE, *Treasurer.*

## REPORT OF THE AUDIT COMMITTEE

The undersigned have examined the above report of the treasurer of the American Historical Association as audited by the American Audit Co. and have found the same correct.

FRANK MALOY ANDERSON.  
GUY STANTON FORD.

DECEMBER 30, 1921.

## REPORT OF THE AMERICAN AUDIT COMPANY

DECEMBER 16, 1921.

THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION,

*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIRs: We have audited your accounts and records from December 1, 1920, to November 30, 1921. Our report, including two exhibits, is as follows:

*Exhibit A.*—Statement of receipts and disbursements, general,

*Exhibit B.*—Statement of receipts and disbursements, American Historical Review.

We verified the cash receipts, as shown by the records, and the cash disbursements were compared with the canceled checks and vouchers on file. They are in agreement with the treasurer's report.

The cash on hand in the funds was reconciled with the bank statements.

We inspected securities of the association, which agree with the records, as follows:

American Historical Association, general:		
Liberty bonds, par value.....	\$35, 650. 00	
Pennsylvania Railroad Co. bonds, par value.....	4, 000. 00	
		\$39, 650. 00
American Historical Review, Liberty bonds, par value.....		1, 200. 00

Respectfully submitted.

THE AMERICAN AUDIT COMPANY,  
By C. R. CRANMER, *Resident Manager*.

[SEAL]

Approved:

F. W. LAFRENTZ, *President*.

Attest:

A. F. LAFRENTZ, *Secretary*.

*EXHIBIT A.*—Receipts and disbursements, general, December 1, 1920, to November 30, 1921

## Receipts:

Annual dues.....	\$7, 059. 71
Life memberships.....	650. 00
Registration fees.....	54. 25
Voluntary contributions.....	2, 903. 75
Publications.....	336. 44
Royalties:	
General.....	\$72. 49
Andrew D. White fund.....	5. 62
	78. 11
Interest:	
Liberty bonds.....	1, 368. 51
Bank account.....	67. 44
	1, 435. 95
Special contribution, the American Historical Review.....	500. 00
Walter E. Beer, executor, the George L. Beer prize fund.....	5, 000. 00
Transferred from Endowment fund.....	188. 91
Miscellaneous.....	56. 87
Total receipts.....	18, 263. 99
Cash on hand Dec. 1, 1920.....	5, 031. 16
	23, 295. 15

## Disbursements:

Secretary and treasurer.....	2, 928. 77
Pacific Coast Branch.....	43. 86
Committee on nominations.....	46. 93
Committee on membership.....	23. 85
Committee on program.....	383. 15
Committee on local arrangements.....	\$203. 30
Less, refunded.....	103. 01
	100. 26
Committee on policy.....	39. 75
Committee on agenda.....	75. 03
Committee on bibliography.....	235. 39
Committee on publications.....	677. 29
Committee on history and education.....	300. 00
Conference on historical societies.....	25. 00
Writings on American history.....	200. 00

## Disbursements—Continued.

American Council of Learned Societies.....	\$153. 89
Robert M. Johnston prize.....	250. 00
American Historical Review .....	7, 040. 90
Securities purchased.....	8, 080. 83
Accrued interest on securities to date of purchase.....	32. 82
<hr/>	
Total disbursements.....	20, 697. 72
Cash on hand Nov. 30, 1921.....	2, 597. 43
	<hr/>
	23, 295. 15

EXHIBIT B.—*Receipts and disbursements, American Historical Review, December 1, 1920, to November 30, 1921*

## Receipts:

The Macmillan Co., per contract.....	\$2, 400. 00
Interest:	
Liberty bonds .....	\$51. 00
Bank account .....	22. 73
	<hr/>
	73. 73
<hr/>	
Total receipts .....	2, 473. 73
Cash on hand Dec. 1, 1920.....	1, 321. 40
	<hr/>
	3, 795. 13

## Disbursements:

Petty cash .....	172. 46
Stationery, printing, and supplies.....	33. 99
Contributors to Review .....	1, 682. 00
Binding.....	34. 00
Publications.....	12. 00
Transcription of documents .....	59. 22
Traveling expenses .....	262. 64
The Macmillan Co., additional payment on account of October number of Review.....	381. 45
Contribution to the American Historical Association.....	500. 00
	<hr/>
Total disbursements .....	3, 137. 76
Cash on hand Nov. 30, 1921.....	657. 37
	<hr/>
	3, 795. 13

## REPORT BY THE SECRETARY FOR THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

(December 30, 1921)

The deliberations of the council have been made lighter by the creation of the council's committee on agenda, which met on November 26 at the Columbia University Club in New York. Many matters of routine were disposed of at that meeting subject to the approval of the council. Others were considered and put into shape for easy and proper consideration when the council met in full session. The business of special interest that came before your council and the disposition made of it were as follows:

The publication of the Austin Papers was taken under consideration, and it was voted that the editor of the Austin Papers be notified that the council, on the basis of its present information, is not prepared to recommend the publication of anything beyond the third volume.

The council expressed its approval of the movement undertaken by the National Council of Teachers of Social Studies. The committee on history teaching in the schools was asked to take active part in cooperation with it and to report to the association at the next meeting. It was voted that the desired cooperation with other associations can best be obtained through a

council, or joint body, embracing representatives of the organizations concerned.

It was voted to accept the invitation of Yale University and the New Haven Colony Historical Society to hold the next annual meeting at New Haven. It was also voted that the first meeting should not be earlier than Wednesday morning, December 27, and the last meeting not later than noon, December 30. It was also voted as the opinion of the council that the annual business meeting should be earlier than the final session. It was also voted that it was the expectation of the council that the meeting for 1923 should be in Columbus, Ohio.

It was voted to accept the report of the special committee on the disposition of records and that the special committee be discharged. (See report of the committee, page 61 of this report.)

It was voted to create a standing committee on research in accordance with a report from a special committee of the council appointed at the meeting of the committee on agenda.

It was voted to approve the report of Mr. Leland for a special committee on railroad rates and that the committee be discharged with a vote of thanks for the services of Mr. Leland. (See page 61-62.)

It was voted to accept the report of the special committee to formulate rules for the George L. Beer prize, and that the committee be discharged with thanks for its services. (Report of the committee, see page 72-73.)

The offer of Mr. Richard H. Lee, counsel for the Associated Advertising Clubs of the World, to investigate complaints against doubtful publications was communicated to the meeting.

Mr. J. F. Jameson was authorized to prepare on behalf of the association a memorial to Congress in regard to an archive building in Washington.

The report of Mr. D. C. Munro for the special committee on the creation of a publication of studies in European history was accepted and the committee was discharged. The president and secretary of the association were authorized to appoint the board of editors of this publication after conference with persons interested in the creation of the publication.

The report of Mr. D. C. Munro for the special committee on a university center in Washington was accepted and the committee was discharged. It was voted to create a standing committee of five members to keep in touch with the movement and report to the council with regard to its activities.

The council reelected Mr. Charles H. Haskins as one of the two representatives of the association in the American Council of Learned Societies.

Mr. Learned reported for the committee on publications. The council voted that announcement be made in the business meeting of the sale of copies of the prize essays at special prices. The chairman of the committee was authorized to contract with a printer for the publication of the prize essay of Mr. Frederick L. Nussbaum. This essay was awarded the prize before it was announced that such essays would no longer be published at the expense of the association, and it was the opinion of the council that the association is under obligation to publish it. It would have been published earlier but for delay in preparation for the printer and in efforts to obtain satisfactory terms for printing.

The committee on bibliography reported through Mr. S. B. Fay, a member of the committee. The council approved the decision of the committee that the bibliography now being prepared should be entitled "A guide to historical literature." The proposed work is not to be issued as a revision of any work hitherto published.

At the close of the report the secretary read the list of appointments to committees and other offices for 1922.

## REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISPOSITION OF RECORDS

The committee has held several conferences in Washington and has agreed on the principles which should govern the disposition of the association's records. These are in accordance with those that were reported orally to the council in December, 1920. The following classes of records are to be destroyed to within five years of date:

*Membership:*

- Correspondence relating to payment of dues.
- Bills for dues.
- Correspondence between secretary and treasurer, and with Macmillan respecting members, and mailing list of the Review.

*Publications:*

- Orders and requests for publications with replies thereto.
- Receipts for publications.
- Orders to printers to ship publications.
- Routine correspondence with Smithsonian Institution and Government Printing Office and Superintendent of Documents.
- Correspondence relating to proofs.

The following classes of records are to be preserved:

*Membership:*

- Applications, nominations, acceptances, resignations, notices of decease.
- Any letters, although in the category to be destroyed, which have autographic or personal interest.

*Publications:*

- Correspondence with authors.
- Records of sales and other disposals of publications.

*Finance:*

- Records of receipts and expenditures, including vouchers, canceled checks, stubs, bank statements, deposit slips, treasurer's reports and statements.

*Committee records:*

- All committee records turned over to the secretary's office, and all committee reports. But reports which have been printed, and routine correspondence of the committee without value may be destroyed.

*Reports of officers:*

- Original reports of the treasurer shall be saved, whether or not they have been printed. Reports of other officers may be destroyed, provided they have been printed.

*Minutes:*

- Original minutes of the business meetings of the association and the original minutes of the council must be saved, even when they have been printed.

*Correspondence:*

- All correspondence dealing with matters of policy must be saved, as well as correspondence dealing with the work of the association and its officers and committees, its relations with other organizations, etc. In short, correspondence must not be destroyed unless it clearly falls within one of the categories of material which is to be destroyed.

Respectfully submitted for the committee.

WALDO G. LELAND, *Chairman.*

## REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON RAILROAD RATES

As chairman and sole member of the committee on railroad rates I beg to report that I have secured from the following passenger associations a reduction as explained below:

- New England Passenger Association.
- Trunk Lines Passenger Association.
- Southeastern Passenger Association.
- Central Passenger Association.
- Western Passenger Association.
- Southwestern Passenger Association.

The territory covered includes all of the United States except the States of Oregon, Washington, California, Nevada, and Arizona, which are in the Transcontinental Association from which I have not as yet heard. In Canada points in Ontario on the Michigan Central, Pere Marquette, and Wabash systems are also included.

The reduction is one-half of the one-way full-tariff fare, applicable on the return trip, which must be by the same route as the going trip, and is contingent upon the attendance of 350 persons, bona fide attendants at the meetings, who have paid a full-tariff fare, going, of not less than 67 cents, and who have fulfilled all the requirements respecting the securing and validation of certificates.

A complete explanation of what must be done in order to secure the reduction has been prepared and is to be printed in the program.

Respectfully submitted.

WALDO G. LELAND,  
*Committee on Railroad Rates.*

#### REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE HERBERT BAXTER ADAMS PRIZE

The committee on the Herbert Baxter Adams prize has voted to award the prize to Einar Joranson's "The Danegeld in France." Prof. Bernadotte E. Schmitt will represent the committee at the annual meeting of the American Historical Association and will make formal announcement of the winner at that time.

Respectfully submitted.

CONYERS READ, *Chairman.*

#### REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLICATIONS

In cooperation with the editor, Mr. Allen R. Boyd, I am able to make the following statement regarding the annual reports for the year 1920-21. Since last December three volumes have been printed and in part distributed: The annual report for 1917, a single volume, and the annual report for 1918, two volumes. The second volume for 1918, The Autobiography of Martin Van Buren, has had an unusually large sale; it caught the attention on its appearance of various reviewers and was thus given some publicity. The report for 1919, Volume I, will contain such papers as were secured at the Cleveland meeting, Miss Griffin's "Writings on American History, 1919" (the fourteenth number in this useful series of bibliographies), and four papers provided by the Agricultural History Society. Volume II in two parts contains the first installment of the Stephen F. Austin Papers, forming a part of the fifteenth report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission. Prof. E. C. Barker, editor, has discovered so much new material that it has seemed only wise on the part of your committee and Mr. Boyd to exercise restraint and for the present to send no additional copy to the press.

The appropriation for the committee for the year was \$700. The balance of this amount remaining on November 30, 1921, was \$22.71. A condensed statement of receipts and expenditures, December 1, 1920, to November 30, 1921, follows:

RECEIPTS	
Prize essays-----	\$213.53
Papers and annual reports-----	97.71
Royalties-----	72.49
Writings on American history-----	20.20
Directory-----	5.00
	<hr/>
	408.93

EXPENDITURES	
Editorial services-----	\$400.00
Indexing -----	50.00
Storage and insurance-----	113.28
Miscellaneous-----	114.01
	<u>677.29</u>
Balance -----	22.71

The return for the prize essays during the year may seem large. The explanation may be found in the statement that your chairman, acting in consultation with Mr. W. G. Leland and Mr. Charles Moore, sold to the various authors as many copies as was possible of their respective essays at the nominal figure of 25 cents per bound copy and 5 cents per unbound copy. As a result of these transactions, the association owns to-day only the following volumes:

	Bound	Unbound
Muzzey-----	17	253
Krehbiel -----	---	195
Carter -----	---	180
Turner-----	---	430
Cole-----	---	275
Williams -----	235	8
Pease -----	347	---
	<u>599</u>	<u>1,341</u>

I recommend that the remainder of these essays be offered henceforth to members of the association and the public at the same nominal prices. Cost for storage and insurance should be for the coming year a slight figure.

Figures for other publications follow:

	Bound	Unbound
Papers -----	---	615
Annual reports-----	2,464	78
Church history papers-----	98	---
Writings on American History-----	995	869
	<u>3,557</u>	<u>1,562</u>

It may not be generally understood that our annual allotments by Congress for printing our annual reports have been \$7,000. In order to avail ourselves of these annual amounts, we are obliged to use them during the fiscal year beginning on July 1. Otherwise any unused balance of the total amounts reverts to the Treasury of the United States. Mr. Boyd, after some investigation of past appropriations, has furnished me with the following figures:

Of the allotment of \$7,000, the balance unexpended was as follows:

1916-----	\$4,000
1917-----	450
1918-----	1,900
1919-----	4,900
1920-----	1,000
	<u>12,250</u>

As recently, however, as June 5, 1920, according to a communication from the Acting Public Printer, there was an apparent deficit of \$4,588.09. In other

words, up to that date in 1919-20 the association would seem to have spent \$11,588.09.

It is Mr. Boyd's belief that our annual losses of our allotments during the past five years have come through the fact that the Government Printing Office has felt obliged to give precedence in the matter of printing to numerous emergency demands on the part of Congress or the executive departments. In brief, the machinery of the Government has been put to the severest strain, and much copy provided by the association has been sidetracked and for months overlooked. Within the coming year the treasurer of the association, in cooperation with the committee, will seek to straighten out a financial arrangement that seems at present anomalous and by no means clear.

At a meeting of the council in Washington on December 27, 1920, the editor was asked to report on some dependable means for carrying on the publication of the Writings on American History. In reply to this request Mr. Boyd writes: "The Government Printing Office is apparently prepared to accept without challenge the Writings as a supplemental volume, and it is believed that the additional expenses will not require an increased allotment once the arrears have been cleared. At any rate it would seem much better, certainly it would be much less expensive to the association, to issue the publication as part of the report rather than to publish it under present conditions independently."

Respectfully submitted.

H. BARRETT LEARNED, *Chairman.*

#### REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF THE CONFERENCE OF HISTORICAL SOCIETIES

The conference of historical societies met in Washington, D. C., in December, 1920, in joint session with the National Association of War History Organizations, and three papers were read and discussed. In the business meeting which followed, Mr. Dunbar Rowland, chairman of the committee on cooperation of historical departments and societies, submitted the seventh and final report of the committee. He reported that the project undertaken by the committee in 1908—that of directing a cooperative search by the historical agencies of the Mississippi Valley of the French archives for historical material relating to the States embraced in that region—had been carried to a successful conclusion, and recommended that the proposal of the Carnegie Institution for Historical Research to edit, publish, and distribute a calendar of this material be accepted. A motion was carried that the report of the committee be adopted and the committee be discharged. This places in a fair way toward completion a highly important piece of work.

Upon the suggestion of the secretary, the conference voted to create committees to take steps toward the preparation of a handbook and toward the compilation of a continuation of the Griffin Bibliography of Historical Societies. The chairman of the conference appointed the following persons to act upon these committees:

*Committee on handbook.*—George N. Fuller, chairman, Michigan Historical Commission; Solon J. Buck, Minnesota Historical Society; John C. Parish, State Historical Society of Iowa.

*Committee on the continuation of the Griffin bibliography.*—Joseph Schafer, chairman, State Historical Society of Wisconsin; Appleton P. C. Griffin, Library of Congress; Julius H. Tuttle, Massachusetts Historical Society.

The chairman and secretary of the conference interviewed Mr. Griffin after the close of the session with regard to the continuation of the Bibliography of

Historical Societies, and the committee has since taken the matter in hand, but has nothing as yet to report.

The committee on the handbook met at Madison, Wis., in May and laid plans for operation. It was determined to make the canvass by States, endeavoring to secure one individual in each State to collect the material for the societies therein and arrange it for compilation in the handbook. The chairman of the committee has made progress in securing this assistance.

A questionnaire sent out on December 1, 1920, to the societies asking for data elicited response from only about 90. This material was placed in the hands of the chairman of the handbook committee.

The secretary sent out a circular in August, 1921, reminding the societies of the dues for the support of the conference. As a result the receipts have been larger than ever before, as shown by the appended financial report, and have permitted the separate publication of the proceedings of the conference. The number of societies remitting dues, however, is comparatively small. The secretary believes that a more equitable basis of financial support may be found in assessing each society \$1 instead of an assessment upon the basis of 1 cent per member. This would lighten the burden of most of the societies, and though it might mean a reduction of the revenue at first it ought to bring a wider support. The secretary plans to propose such a change to the conference at the December meeting.

The notice of the December meeting and a copy of the preliminary announcement have been sent to each society, together with the proceedings of the conference in the session of 1920.

JOHN C. PARISH, *Secretary.*

*Statement of finances of the conference of historical societies for the year 1921*

Receipts:

Cash on hand Dec. 20, 1920	\$36. 74
Dues from societies, 1921	102. 30
Appropriation from American Historical Association	25. 00
	<hr/>
	164. 04

Expenses:

Bill from 1920	5. 00
Mailing out circular letter, Sept., 1921—	
Typing mailing list	\$4. 50
Multigraphing letter	4. 10
Envelopes	5. 50
Addressing and mailing	3. 00
Postage	5. 00
	<hr/>
	22. 10
Postage	2. 90
Printing of proceedings of 1920	90. 65
Multigraphing circular letter, Dec., 1921	3. 45
Postage on proceedings	8. 00
	<hr/>
	132. 10
Balance on hand Dec. 20, 1921	31. 94
	<hr/>
	164. 04

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON BIBLIOGRAPHY

The committee on bibliography wishes to report that its work upon the proposed revision of Adams' Manual of Historical Literature has progressed satis-

factorily, although somewhat more slowly than it anticipated, largely because of the resignations of several of the chapter editors. It hopes to have the manuscript ready for the publisher by the 1st of June, 1922.

It wishes further to report to you under the following three heads: Change of title and arrangements with publishers; expenses; survey of libraries.

*Change of title and arrangements with publishers.*—The committee on bibliography had at first intended to revise Adams' Manual of Historical Literature and simply make a new edition of it, bringing it up to date. But as the committee proceeded with the work it became evident that very few of the titles in Adams would be retained and that the work would be practically a new book. It has therefore seemed best to abandon the idea of making a new edition of Adams and instead to adopt a different title and prepare a wholly new and independent work. In the preface, of course, reference will be made to the inspiration which came from Doctor Adams's work and due appreciation will be expressed of the help which it has afforded.

It is proposed that the title-page should read something as follows: Guide to Historical Literature, prepared by George M. Dutcher, Henry R. Shipman, Sidney B. Fay, Augustus H. Shearer, William H. Allison, committee on bibliography of the American Historical Association. Macmillan & Co., New York, 1922.

In the preface it will be told why the committee on bibliography has included some titles and omitted others, explaining as fully as possible the basis of choice. It will be made clear that the American Historical Association is no more responsible for the choice of titles adopted and the expression of views contained in the reviews than is the case in other works published by the association, such as the American Historical Review and the prize essays.

So far as possible the initials of writers of reviews will be appended. This, however, will not be done in the case of reviews which consist only of a few words. It will be explained that the chapter editor alone is responsible for the selection of books in his chapter and for the unsigned reviews which appear in it. The names of all those who have contributed reviews to a chapter will appear at the head of the chapter, but it will be made clear that these contributors are responsible only for what they themselves have contributed and initialed.

The preface will also express the gratitude of the committee to the chapter editors and the large number of reviewers who have so cordially and helpfully contributed of their time and special knowledge toward making a book which, so far as possible, shall be representative of the best American historical scholarship.

The committee has had business negotiations looking toward the publication of the volume both with Harper Bros., who published Adams' Manual, and with the Macmillan Co., which is very anxious to publish the book. No contract has as yet been signed with either firm, but it is expected an arrangement will be made with the Macmillan Co., unless Harper Bros. makes a much more favorable offer than they have made hitherto. The Macmillan Co. makes the very favorable offer of giving, as profits to the American Historical Association, 10 per cent on the first thousand copies sold, 12½ per cent on the second thousand, and 15 per cent on those sold thereafter. It will also make the unusually generous allowance of 20 per cent of the cost of setting up for proof corrections. This ought to afford to the association an early and considerable revenue as soon as the book is published, which will much more than reim-

burse the association for the advance made to the committee on bibliography for its expenses. The council at the meeting in Washington, December, 1920, authorized the treasurer and secretary of the association, in consultation with the committee, to sign such a contract as they should deem fit.

*Expenses.*—The committee on bibliography has been asked to estimate the probable expenses for typing and in other ways preparing for publication the manuscript of the proposed Guide to Historical Literature. Your committee asks for this purpose that it be empowered to draw on the treasurer of the association up to the amount of \$500, a sum to be repaid from the profits from the sale of the "Guide." It is difficult, if not impossible, to make an exact estimate, but the committee believe that the outlay will not be in excess of that amount.

*Survey of libraries.*—The communication sent to the council by a committee of university librarians signed by James T. Gerould, chairman, and referred to the committee on bibliography on November 26, has been carefully considered by the committee on bibliography, which reports strongly in favor of the general plan, and, in order to prevent delays, makes specific recommendations.

The subject proposed is a survey of libraries by experts in order to locate particularly strong collections of books, in part for the benefit of the user and in part to guide librarians in their purchases.

It recommends that for the present at least the survey be confined to books in groups or collections, and not primarily to individual volumes.

As to the books in groups or collections it thinks the procedure should be, first, the division of the field of history more or less minutely. As a possible division it suggests the 26 divisions of the 29 divisions in the Guide to Historical Literature now in process of preparation—that is to say, omitting the division into general history, medieval history, modern history, and the history of the last 50 years—together with an additional division for collections on the World War.

It suggests the appointment of a survey committee representing the American Historical Association for each of these 26 fields of history. Each survey committee should lay down the general principles for the investigators in each field to follow in examining different libraries. To be worth while, these suggestions should go into detail, and, to insure uniformity, it recommends that one of the usually accepted library classifications be used. In view of the fact that more libraries use the Dewey classification than any other, and that books in other libraries can be adapted to this scheme, it recommends the adoption of the Dewey classification as a basis. Each survey committee should utilize such printed material with regard to special collections as is now available. Examples are appended of possible divisions of a field of history. It thinks that the survey committee could properly ask that the number of books relating to a field, and the number of books in each subdivision of the field, should be reported together with the special or unusual book or group of books which a particular library might have.

It suggests that each survey committee, having outlined a plan for its field of history, should appoint investigators to examine particular libraries. The committee of librarians suggests that these investigators should be specialists traveling from library to library. If this suggestion were followed, it would be necessary to wait for special funds, and, in addition, the specialist would be compelled to ask for assistance in each library which he visited, because of differences in arrangement and classification. The committee on bibliography

recommends therefore that each survey committee appoint for each library to be investigated two investigators, preferably the librarian and a professor of history. It does not believe that undue prejudice will arise from the fact that men are investigating their own libraries, if the investigators are in close touch with the survey committee and follow its suggestions and outlines. In large libraries, it believes that members of the library and teaching staff could be used by the several survey committees as investigators. In reference libraries, apart from universities, it believes that professors at neighboring institutions could be called upon, e. g., Columbia professors for the New York Public Library.

The investigators' reports from different libraries should be correlated and cumulated by the survey committee in each field of history.

The survey committee, in their final report, should indicate the locations of groups or collections of books, dividing the country into regions similar to the regional divisions of the Richardson Union List of collections of European History, 1912, i. e. New England, Middle States and Canada, South Atlantic, the South Central, the North Central, the Far West.

*Finances.*—The committee suggests the foregoing plan because it thinks it is practicable both from the standpoint of the work to be done and from that of finances. If an education foundation would assist financially, the whole matter could be expedited by special investigators who should be recompensed for their time and expense; but in any case a substantial beginning might be made.

*Publication of results.*—It suggests that this be done in the American Historical Association reports, or, if feasible, chapter by chapter in the review.

*Periodic revision of results.*—Such a revision is suggested by the librarians' committee. The committee on bibliography thinks it can be accomplished through the survey committee which would consist of more than one person, perhaps of five. Such a committee should be permanent. Necessary changes in the committee would not disturb the continuity of its action and resurveys might be made at five-year intervals.

The librarians suggest that, when the committee has surveyed the field, it will urge development along particular lines and suggest to library administrations the formal acceptance of the responsibility of the field or fields of collection assigned to them. Such assignment would be at least in part regional in basis. Library administrations, too, might easily publish the information they have about their collections which is now available, including lists of such material in their annual reports. The committee on bibliography suggests that the main initiative in this work come from the American Library Association or from the college and reference section of the American Library Association, or from the various associations of college and university librarians, calling upon the American Historical Association if they so desire. It believes that the idea that some libraries would be willing to refrain from intensive efforts in any field, would not have been favorably received several years ago, but apparently recent tendencies favor the development of cooperation both in purchasing and in loans, so that results from the proposed program may be looked for hopefully.

The committee would add that the suggestion has been made that the 26 investigations in the field of history will involve a burden not relished by some institutions, but none of these investigations will overlap, and, on the whole, the work will be much less formidable and much better done if it is divided into 26 parts with varying committees in charge and varying sets of suggestions.

It suggests, finally, a general survey committee to supervise and coordinate the work of the 26 special survey committees. This general committee should include among its members at least one representative librarian.

Respectfully submitted.

HENRY R. SHIPMAN,  
*Acting Chairman.*

SIDNEY B. FAY,  
AUGUSTUS H. SHEARER,  
WILLIAM H. ALLISON,  
GEORGE M. DUTCHER,

973. *United States.*

- .10 Discovery.
- .11 Precolumbian.
- .15 Columbus.
- .16 Spanish and Portuguese.
- .17 English.
- .18 French
- .19 Other nations.
- .20 Colonial.
- .22 New England settlement, 1620-1643.
- .23 New England Confederacy, 1643-1664.
- .24 Conquest of New Netherlands, 1664-1689.
- .25 Early French wars, 1689-1732.
- .26 Extension of English rule, 1732-1763.
- .27 Last years of the colonies, 1763-1775.
- .30 Revolution and confederation.
- .31 Political history; causes, results.
- .32 Diplomatic history; relations with other nations.
- .33 Special campaigns and battles.
  - .331 Campaigns of 1775.
  - .332 Campaigns of 1776.
  - .333 Campaigns of 1777.
  - .334 Campaigns of 1778.
  - .335 Campaigns of 1779.
  - .336 Campaigns of 1780.
  - .337 Campaigns of 1781.
  - .338 Campaigns of 1782.
  - .339 Events of 1783.
- .34 General military history.
- .35 Naval history.
- .36 Celebrations, anniversaries, commemorations.
- .37 Prisons, hospitals, etc.
- .38 Personal narratives, vindications, secret service.
- .39 Illustrative material.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON MILITARY HISTORY

In the absence of General Swift, I have the honor to submit the following report of the committee on military history.

The first meeting of the committee on military history was held in Washington, February 9, 1921, Brig. Gen. Eben Swift, chairman, presiding.

A resolution was adopted to appoint a committee to arrange for a joint meeting with the National Association of the State War Historical Associations in Washington in April and for a meeting as a part of the American Historical Association meeting in St. Louis in December. In accordance with this resolution a public meeting was held in the assembly hall of the Cosmos Club on April 29, 1921. The program was as follows:

Chairman, Col. Oliver L. Spaulding, jr., chief of the Historical Branch, General Staff, United States Army.

Two brigades (illustrated), by Brig. Gen. Eben Swift, United States Army, retired.

Apremont (illustrated), by Lieut. Col. Dorrance Reynolds, Reserve Corps, United States Army.

What happens in battle, by Maj. John N. Greely, General Staff, United States Army.

Despite a very heavy rain and wind storm, the meeting was well attended, there being over 125 present.

The second meeting of the committee was held April 30, 1921. The chairman stated that he had arranged with General Drum, commandant at Fort Leavenworth, to take charge of the preparation of a session on military history at the annual meeting of the association in St. Louis in December.

It was resolved to hold another public meeting of a general character on military history in Washington during the fall, and to make a special effort to secure the attendance of a larger number of officers; and also to arrange for a meeting to be held in Washington during the months of February or March, 1922, which should provide an opportunity for technical discussion. The Washington members of the committee were charged with the details of these meetings.

And it was voted to adopt as a tentative policy the preparation of a series of volumes devoted to studies in military history to appear at intervals and to be published under the auspices of the American Historical Association by some publishing firm with which satisfactory arrangements might be made.

The public meeting in the fall was held Saturday evening, December 3, 1921, in the hall of the Carnegie Institution. Brig. Gen. Eben Swift presided. The program was as follows:

The campaign and battle of Spring Hill. Thomas R. Hay.

The American Indian in the World War. Lieut. Col. Jennings C. Wise.

The doctrine of mutual aid. Col. Samuel C. Vestal, United States Army.

There was a gratifying attendance and the papers were received with marked interest.

A meeting of the committee is planned for the near future, to consider work for the coming year. Encouraged by the success of the two public meetings in Washington, an effort will be made to continue them. Consideration will be given also to arranging a session on military history at the next annual meeting of the association.

While there have been no new developments in the matter of publications, these have not been forgotten, and opportunity will be sought for undertaking such work.

In view of the increased attention now being given to military study in the universities and colleges, it has been suggested that a survey of the courses offered in military history would be of value. The committee will consider ways and means for making such a survey. Not only would the information collected be useful in itself, but the very fact of its collection might stimulate the extension of existing courses and the institution of new ones. And perhaps the committee might be fortunate enough to assist, by advice, and by acting as a clearing house for information, in shaping and orienting some of these courses.

It may be not without interest to note, in conclusion, a change in the status of the historical branch, war plans division, General Staff, United States Army, with which the committee is in close association. It has become a part of the Army War College, and is now known as the historical section of that insti-

tution. The transfer has involved no changes in functions, organization, or personnel.

Respectfully submitted.

OLIVER L. SPAULDING, JR.,  
*Acting Chairman.*

REPORT OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE TO STUDY AND REPORT ON THE PROPOSAL TO  
ESTABLISH A COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH

The undersigned, appointed at the meeting of the committee on agenda on November 26, 1921, as a subcommittee to study and report on the proposal of Prof. William K. Boyd that a committee on research be constituted, submit herewith the following recommendations:

That a committee on historical research be constituted as a standing committee of the American Historical Association, such committee to consist of five members.

That the function of the committee on historical research shall be the stimulation of historical investigation, especially in those educational institutions which do not maintain a graduate school.

That the duties of the committee on historical research shall include the following: To encourage, either in cooperation with the National Research Council or independently, the development by college authorities of facilities for historical research; to encourage instructors in history to utilize such facilities; to arrange for periodic conferences of instructors and students who may be interested in the work of the committee.

It is suggested that if the foregoing recommendations are adopted the committee on historical research might undertake at once, under its powers, either in cooperation with the National Research Council or independently, a survey of the colleges throughout the country by means of a questionnaire addressed to each college president asking what special historical collections exist at the institution; what sum of money is spent annually on the upkeep and enlargement of such collections; if any definite historical research is being conducted; if there is any means of publishing the results of such research, and pointing out in an accompanying letter the desirability of fostering research in small centers.

It is likewise suggested that the committee on historical research might under its powers address a questionnaire to the several professors of history in the colleges concerned, asking each what field he is particularly interested in; if he is carrying on research himself or is directing research of others at his college. When the answers to such a questionnaire are in hand the committee might utilize them to promote closer cooperation among professors and students interested in the same field.

Some of the results which might be expected from the work of the committee on historical research are set forth in Professor Boyd's memorandum attached to this report.

Respectfully submitted.

CARLTON J. H. HAYES.

STATEMENT IN RE COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH

I suggest that a committee on research be constituted with the purpose of stimulating historical investigation, especially in those educational institutions which do not maintain a graduate school.

Among its duties should be the following:

To make a survey by means of a questionnaire of the support, financial and otherwise, given to historical research by the various institutions, and to find to what extent special collections of historical material are fostered.

To make inquiry of the instructors in history in the colleges or institutions to which the questionnaire is sent concerning their special interests and if they are at present conducting investigation.

To offer suggestions, or aid, to such instructors as seem receptive toward the work of the committee. Perhaps a conference might be arranged from time to time at the annual meetings of the association.

Regarding the results to be obtained, I should remark:

There is a possibility of disclosing unknown sources for various aspects of American history in particular. There is also the possibility of inducing certain institutions to undertake the collection of material relating to the region in which they are located. Such a result would not only sensitize the institution, but would be, in the long run, of benefit to the cause of history in this country.

There is the possibility of turning younger men of ambition into channels of investigation that are practicable and useful. External stimulus is often all that is needed; given a small college with slight equipment, it is hard sledding for the instructor with ambition to do investigative work; a little stimulus or suggestion from without may turn the tide in his favor.

Another result might be a kind of moral rating of colleges; it might be disclosed that some small institutions are favorable locations for men of ambition, and that we would know more definitely of the possibilities of institutions when they seek instructors.

Finally, there might arise a closer contact between the larger centers of learning and the less pretentious ones, helpful to both.

In conclusion, let me point out the practicality of this plan. I can only reason by comparison. Two years ago the National Council on Research sent a questionnaire to the colleges, inquiring to what extent the institutions as institutions supported research. One college could give only a negative answer, but, shamed by its poor record, immediately established a committee on research and last year spent \$1,000 on the cause. Publicity and confession brought a new policy.

As editor of the South Atlantic Quarterly I have more than once been able to procure valuable copy from men in small colleges by solicitation, making it evident to my mind that external stimulus is just now the greatest desideratum for many institutions.

Respectfully submitted.

WILLIAM K. BOYD.

#### GEORGE LOUIS BEER PRIZE

In accordance with the terms of a bequest by the late George Louis Beer, of New York City, the American Historical Association announces the **GEORGE LOUIS BEER PRIZE IN EUROPEAN INTERNATIONAL HISTORY**. The prize will be \$250 in cash and will be awarded annually for the best work upon "any phase of European international history since 1895."

The competition is limited to citizens of the United States and to works that shall be submitted to the American Historical Association. A work may be submitted in either manuscript or print, and it should not exceed in length 50,000 words of text, with the additional necessary notes, bibliography, ap-

Works must be submitted on or before July 1 of each year in order to be considered for the competition of that year. In the case of printed works the date of publication must fall within a period of 18 months prior to July 1.

A work submitted in competition for the Herbert Baxter Adams prize may at the same time, if its subject meets the requirements, be submitted for the George Louis Beer prize; but no work that shall have been so submitted for both prizes will be admitted to the competition for the Beer prize in any subsequent year.

In making the award the committee in charge will consider not only research, accuracy, and originality but also clearness of expression, logical arrangement, and general excellence of style.

The prize is designed especially to encourage those who have not published previously any considerable work nor obtained an established reputation.

Only works in the English language will receive consideration.

Inquiries concerning the prize should be addressed to the chairman of the committee or to the secretary of the American Historical Association, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.

#### REPORT OF THE HISTORICAL MANUSCRIPTS COMMISSION

I beg leave to state that the first volume of the Austin Papers was delivered in manuscript to the committee on publications a considerable time ago, that the second, and last, volume of those papers has probably reached or will reach the same committee within a few days, and that the manuscript of the Calhoun Letters will most likely be completed at about the close of the present academic year.

The Historical Manuscripts Commission does not desire to propose any action to the council at this time.

Respectfully submitted.

JUSTIN H. SMITH, *Chairman.*

#### REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORY TEACHING IN THE SCHOOLS

Under date of December 2 copies of the following statement were sent to members of the committee on history teaching in the schools:

Before the appointment of the present committee, proposals had been made in various conferences for a survey of the teaching of history and the social sciences as an indispensable condition of further progress in the construction of school programs. Dr. Max Farrand, of the Commonwealth Fund, was already interested in these proposals and had in mind a plan for bringing together representatives of the different fields for a general exchange of views on the questions involved. On his initiative several conferences in which our committee has been represented, have been held, and several others are scheduled for the next two weeks.

The discussions so far have developed a surprising degree of harmony in the treatment of the fundamental issues, and have raised a distinct promise of success in adjusting the history program to the special claims of sociology, economics, geography, and political science. There will be later the problem of dealing with a few noisy reformers whose chief qualification for the work of reconstructing the "social studies" is a certain impartial ignorance of all the "social studies." But they will in time perhaps refute themselves.

It is now proposed that the council of the American Historical Association should take the initiative in asking the Commonwealth Fund for an appropriation for a survey to include:

A history of the teaching of history and the social sciences in the schools.

A study of present practice in the teaching of these subjects in the principal countries of the world.

A special study of new experiments in the teaching of these subjects in the United States and in any other part of the world where such experiments may be discovered.

The purpose of the survey is, of course, to lay a solid and enduring foundation for the construction of definite school programs.

The question of taking this step is submitted by the council to the committee on history teaching in the schools. Kindly let me have at your earliest opportunity your opinion.

(Signed) HENRY JOHNSON, *Chairman.*

The opinion of the committee so far as it has been expressed (two of the members have not yet responded) is that a survey of the kind proposed is desirable, and that the council should be requested to apply for an appropriation sufficient for the purpose.

A few days after the question had been submitted to the committee on history teaching in the schools, Doctor Farrand reported that he had already covered the ground fully in conference with the educational research committee of the Commonwealth Fund and had found that committee more interested in actual experimentation than in a historical survey. A request for an appropriation to assist experiments already started, and to encourage the starting of other experiments, would apparently be received with favor. It is also recognized that an intelligent judgment of the kinds of experiments to be encouraged would involve some study of antecedents and of present practice. But this study would apparently be limited to conditions directly related to such experiments and directly suggested by them.

With the main emphasis thus shifted, the opinion of the committee on history teaching in the schools becomes all the more important; but as the time is too short for further expression of opinion by that committee the chairman can present only his personal views.

The position taken by the educational research committee of the Commonwealth Fund, it is at once clear, is in danger of becoming the position of numerous reformers of the so-called "social studies"; namely, that the study of human experience is to be tolerated only so far as some immediate situation seems to call for it. The obligation rests upon historical students to assert and to show that the past can be utilized in making the present intelligible only by making the past itself intelligible.

If the council should decline to take any further steps in the matter, it is possible that some other organization might secure an appropriation from the Fund, and, freed from all control by historical scholarship, might commit the schools of the country to a line of experimentation that would reduce history to the casual place which it occupied in the school curriculum 300 years ago. There is plainly a movement in that direction.

The course respectfully suggested is that the council ask the Commonwealth Fund for an appropriation of \$10,000 for a study of the present state of history teaching, with the understanding that the council does not commit itself to any limitation of the committee which should be free to place its own interpretation upon the range of data that may be essential in arriving at an intelligent estimate of the value of any experiment now in progress or on any proposed experiment.

Respectfully submitted.

HENRY JOHNSON, *Chairman.*

FINAL REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON A UNIVERSITY CENTER FOR RESEARCH IN  
WASHINGTON

The undersigned were appointed a committee in December, 1920, to cooperate



promotion of research in the physical and biological sciences with which, it seemed to the joint committee, the proposed center should be in liaison; the more so as a closer cooperation would appear to be not impossible at some future time.

Finally, the organization in 1919 of the American Council of Learned Societies, of which the Historical, Political Science, and Economic Associations are constituent members, appeared to provide a convenient means of maintaining a contact with organized scholarship in the social studies, as well as in the whole range of humanistic learning should the service of the center later be extended to the wider field.

Having these considerations in mind, it seemed clear to the joint committee that it must for the present be content with the organization of a service rather than of an institution; a service which must depend chiefly on the voluntary cooperation of scholars resident in Washington, and which must be performed with a minimum expense of administration.

A modified plan was therefore drawn up by the committee and presented to a conference of scholars living in the District of Columbia. This conference held two sessions, the first of which was attended by both members of your committee, who, with Mr. Hunt, who was also present, constituted a majority of the committee of 1916, and as such gave assent to the proposed modifications in the original plan. The request for voluntary cooperation in the conduct of the center met with a ready response from the conference and the American Council on Education, represented by its director, generously offered to assume, within a reasonable amount, the expenses of administration. There seemed, therefore, to be no obstacle to the immediate organization of the center, which was accomplished by the adoption of articles of organization.

By these articles an association of not less than 15 scholars residing in the District of Columbia is formed for the purpose of maintaining a university center for research in Washington. The organizers, their successors and associates constitute the board of research advisers, which is the self-governing body of control of the center. The board is organized in a committee of management and in technical divisions. The committee of management, which is the administrative body of the board, has also the status of a committee of the American Council on Education and three of its members count as representatives of that body. Its membership also includes representatives of the American Council of Learned Societies and of the National Research Council.

The technical divisions represent the fields of learning in which the center is prepared to render its service. At present there are five such divisions: History, political science, international law and diplomacy, economics, and statistics. Each division organizes itself and maintains relations with organized scholarship in its field of study.

The service offered by the board of research advisers takes the form of information respecting the nature and the location of material, assistance in securing access to it, and, in the case of graduate students, of advice and guidance in its utilization. It does not, however, include the giving of instruction, nor training in methods of investigation, nor supplying purely bibliographical information which should be available in any large library. It is assumed that graduate students who desire to work under the auspices of the University Center will already have received the instruction and training necessary to qualify them for work of research, and that they shall have reached a stage in their work where recourse to the collections in Washington has become necessary to its further prosecution.

The service of the board is offered not only to graduate students but to more advanced investigators. Indeed, the board particularly desires to be instrumental in promoting research in Washington by mature scholars. Naturally, no direction of such research is proposed, but it can frequently be materially facilitated by supplying information respecting collections and by the tender of good offices in securing access to them.

As already indicated, the attractive residential feature of the earlier plan has had to be abandoned for the time being, but it is hoped that it may prove possible to provide opportunity for students who are in Washington contemporaneously to come in contact with each other. A common table, privileges in one or more of the Washington clubs, occasional talks by officials and by resident or visiting scholars and men of affairs are well within the present range of possibility, while access to the offices of the Department of Historical Research in the Carnegie Institution, of the Institute for Government Research, and of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace is already assured.

The regulations adopted by the board of research advisers are few and simple. Students in the graduate departments of American universities who desire to work under the auspices of the University Center must make direct application by letter to the secretary, stating the subject of investigation, the stage reached in it, and the nature of the work which it is proposed to do in Washington. The application must be accompanied by a statement from the dean of the school in which the student is enrolled to the effect that the request has the approval of the university authorities; it should also be accompanied by a letter from the officer of instruction under whose guidance the student is conducting his investigation, containing such information respecting the student and his work as may be useful to the advisers. Upon arrival in Washington a student must register in the office of the secretary, whereupon he will be assigned to an adviser, to whom he should at once report. The adviser will keep a brief record of the student's work, and will furnish a report on it to the secretary, who will forward a copy to the dean of the school from which the student comes.

Students in foreign universities and other investigators should also make application by letter, stating the nature of their proposed researches, and should register with the secretary upon arrival in Washington. They, too, will be referred to advisers, but no report will be made upon their work.

It should be remembered that access to governmental collections and archives is subject to official regulation and discretion and can not be taken for granted. The University Center can only offer its good services in securing such access.

Such, then, is the history, organization, purpose, and present scope of the University Center for Research in Washington. It is now ready to offer its services and has in press an announcement which will be distributed early in January and which will also be printed in the January issue of the Educational Record, the organ of the American Council on Education.

It remains to deal particularly with the provision that has been made for the promotion of historical research. The division of history has been organized as follows:

J. Franklin Jameson, chairman, director of the Department of Historical Research in the Carnegie Institution of Washington.

Gaillard Hunt, vice chairman, editor and chief of the division of publications in the Department of State.

George F. Zook, secretary, specialist in higher education in the United States Bureau of Education.

Lieut. Commdr. Edward Breck, United States Naval Reserve Force, executive officer of the Historical Branch, Division of Naval Intelligence.

Julius Klein, director of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.  
H. Barrett Learned.

Waldo G. Leland, Department of Historical Research, Carnegie Institution of Washington.

Charles Moore, acting chief of the division of manuscripts, Library of Congress.

Herbert Putnam, Librarian of Congress.

Richard A. Rice, acting chief of the division of prints, Library of Congress.

Col. Oliver L. Spaulding, jr., United States Army, chief of the Historical Branch War Plans Division, General Staff

The division has already on hand comprehensive information respecting the libraries, archives, and other collections of historical material in Washington and is preparing a list of officials and of resident scholars who should be able to furnish information and to render assistance to investigators. A meeting of the division is held once a month for the purpose of discussing and perfecting means of promoting historical research in Washington. The division has voted to present annually to the council of the American Historical Association a special report of its activities, in order that that body may have the fullest possible information respecting the work of the University Center for Research in Washington in the field of history.

In conclusion your committee begs that the foregoing may be accepted as their final report and recommend that the council take into consideration the appropriate relation to be maintained between the association and the division of history of the University Center. As an annex to this report the committee append the Announcement of the University Center prepared for the January, 1922, issue of *The Educational Record*. This contains the articles of association, the board of research advisers, the divisions of the board, and the regulations which have been adopted.

Respectfully submitted.

DANA C. MUNRO.

WALDO G. LELAND.

## APPENDIX

### UNIVERSITY CENTER FOR RESEARCH IN WASHINGTON

#### ARTICLES OF ORGANIZATION

The undersigned hereby associate themselves for the establishment and conduct of an organization to be known as the University Center for Research in Washington.

The purpose of the University Center for Research in Washington shall be to promote and facilitate research in archives, libraries, and other collections located in the District of Columbia on the part of students in the graduate departments of American and foreign universities and of others.

The control of the University Center shall be in the board of research advisers.

The board of research advisers shall in the first instance consist of the signatories of this association. It shall hereafter consist of at least 15 residents of the District of Columbia, and shall have power to add to its numbers to fill vacancies in its membership, and to name associate research advisers to assist in the performance of its functions.

The board of research advisers shall meet at least once a year in the District of Columbia. It shall choose annually a presiding officer who shall be known as president.

The board of research advisers shall be organized in a committee of management and technical divisions, of which the following are now established:

Division of history.

Division of political science.

Division of international law and diplomacy.

Division of economics.

Division of statistics.

The committee of management shall include representatives of the National Research Council and of the American Council of Learned Societies and at least three members appointed by the American Council on Education, and shall constitute a committee of the latter body. It shall choose its own chairman.

Each technical division shall be presided over by a chairman who shall be chosen annually by the members of the division.

The functions of the committee of management shall be to correspond with university authorities respecting students who come to Washington to work under the auspices of the University Center, to formulate the regulations under which students may be admitted to work under such auspices, to register such students, to assign them to the appropriate technical divisions, and to furnish to the university authorities such reports on their work as may be required.

The functions of the technical divisions shall be to advise such students as may be assigned to them, to facilitate their access to the material which the nature of their work may require, and to furnish reports on their work to the committee of management. The technical divisions shall also facilitate the researches of other investigators.

The board shall prepare an annual report which shall be presented to the American Council on Education, the National Research Council, the American Council of Learned Societies, and to such organizations and institutions as may be determined.

The foregoing articles may be amended from time to time by a majority vote of the full board.

L. S. ROWE,  
JAMES BROWN SCOTT,  
FRANCIS WALKER,  
JULIUS KLEIN,  
WINTHROP M. DANIELS,  
HERBERT PUTNAM,  
JOSEPH A. HILL,  
H. BARRETT LEARNED,  
PAUL S. REINSCH,  
BALTHASAR H. MEYER,

GAILLARD HUNT,  
CHAS. CHENEY HYDE,  
WALDO G. LELAND,  
S. P. CAPEN,  
W. F. WILLOUGHBY,  
CHARLES MOORE,  
RICHARD A. RICE,  
J. F. JAMESON,  
GEORGE F. ZOOK.

#### BOARD OF RESEARCH ADVISERS

*President*, Leo S. Rowe, Ph.D., LL.D., director general of the Pan American Union.

*Secretary*, Samuel P. Capen, Ph. D., LL. D., L. H. D., director of the American Council on Education.

Edward Breck, Ph. D., lieutenant commander, U. S. N. R. F., executive of historical section, Navy Department.

Winthrop M. Daniels, A. M., member of Interstate Commerce Commission.

E. Dana Durand, Ph. D., Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

David Jayne Hill, A. M., LL. D., D. ès L., former Ambassador to Germany.

Joseph A. Hill, Ph. D., chief statistician, Bureau of the Census.

Gaillard Hunt, Litt. D., LL. D., editor and chief of division of publications, State Department.

Charles Cheney Hyde, A. M., former professor of law, Northwestern University.

J. Franklin Jameson, Ph. D., Litt. D., LL. D., director, department of historical research, Carnegie Institution of Washington.

Vernon L. Kellogg, M. S., LL. D., executive secretary, National Research Council.

Julius Klein, Ph. D., director, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

Baron Serge Korff, D. C. L., professor of diplomatic and political history of modern Europe, Georgetown University.

H. Barrett Learned, Ph. D., professor of history, Stanford University.

Waldo G. Leland, A. M., department of historical research, Carnegie Institution of Washington.

M. O. Lorenz, Ph. D., Interstate Commerce Commission.

Lewis Meriam, A. M., LL. B., staff member, Institute of Government Research.

Balthasar H. Meyer, Ph. D., member of Interstate Commerce Commission.

Adolph C. Miller, A. M., member of Federal Reserve Board.

Charles Moore, Ph. D., acting chief, division of manuscripts, Library of Congress.

Thomas W. Page, Ph. D., chairman, United States Tariff Commission.

Herbert Putnam, Litt. D., LL. D., Librarian of Congress.

Paul S. Reinsch, Ph. D., LL. D., counselor to Chinese Government.

Richard A. Rice, A. M., acting chief, division of prints, Library of Congress.

John Jacob Rogers, A. M., Member of Congress from Massachusetts.

James Brown Scott, A. M., J. U. D., secretary of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Oliver L. Spaulding, jr., LL. D., colonel, United States Army, chief of historical section, Army War College.

Ethelbert Stewart, chief statistician of the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

George Sutherland, LL. D.,<sup>1</sup> former United States Senator from Utah.

Henry C. Taylor, Ph. D., chief of the Office of Farm Management, Department of Agriculture.

Eliot Wadsworth, A. B., Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

Francis Walker, Ph. D., chief economist, Federal Trade Commission.

William F. Willoughby, A. B., director, Institute of Government Research.

George F. Zook, Ph. D., specialist in higher education, United States Bureau of Education.

#### COMMITTEE OF MANAGEMENT

Messrs. Rowe, Capen, Jameson, Kellogg, and Willoughby.

#### DIVISION OF HISTORY

Messrs. Jameson, Breck, Hunt, Klein, Learned, Leland, Moore, Rice, Spaulding, and Zook.

#### DIVISION OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

Messrs. Rowe and Willoughby.

#### DIVISION OF INTERNATIONAL LAW AND DIPLOMACY

Messrs. Scott, Hunt, D. J. Hill, Hyde, Korff, Reinsch, Rogers, Rowe, and Sutherland.

#### DIVISION OF ECONOMICS

Messrs. Walker, Daniels, Durand, Meyer, Miller, Page, Stewart, Taylor, and Wadsworth.

#### DIVISION OF STATISTICS

Messrs. J. A. Hill, Klein, Lorenz, and Meriam.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT

#### HISTORICAL STATEMENT

The organization of the University Center for Research in Washington is the outcome of a movement originated in May, 1916, when representatives of the departments of history and political science in several of the larger universities met in conference at Columbia University and appointed a committee to formulate a plan for the establishment in Washington, through the cooperation of American universities, of a residential center for graduate students who should desire to conduct researches in the archives, libraries, and other collections of the National Government. Such a plan was drawn up and was approved by a second conference of university representatives held in Cincinnati in December of the same year. The entrance of the United States into the war a few months later, however, made it necessary to postpone indefinitely the execution of the project.

In December, 1920, the American Historical Association and the American Political Science Association appointed a joint committee for the purpose of reviving the plan and of carrying it out with such modifications as might have become desirable because of changed conditions. As a result of the activities of this committee two conferences of scholars resident in Washington were held in the fall of 1921, at which the articles of organization printed on another page were adopted.

<sup>1</sup> Oct. 2, 1922, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

## SCOPE AND PURPOSE

The University Center for Research in Washington is maintained by a voluntary association of scholars, organized in a self-governing body styled the board of research advisers. Through its committee of management this board is in contact with the interests most concerned in the objects of the University Center; the membership of the committee includes representatives of the American Council on Education, which is the organ of the various associations of American universities and colleges; of the American Council of Learned Societies, which represents organized scholarship in the humanistic fields of study; and of the National Research Council, which, while chiefly representative of the physical and biological sciences, is also concerned with the organization of research in general.

The purpose of the University Center is the promotion of research by rendering aid, information, and advice to graduate students and other investigators who desire to make use of the archives, libraries, and other collections in Washington. It is the hope of the board of research advisers that they may thus make more effective to scholarship the provisions of the act of Congress of March 3, 1901, namely:

That facilities for study and research in the Government departments, the Library of Congress, the National Museum, the Zoological Park, the Bureau of Ethnology, the Fish Commission, the Botanic Gardens, and similar institutions hereafter established shall be afforded to scientific investigators and to duly qualified individuals, students, and graduates of institutions of learning in the several States and Territories, as well as in the District of Columbia, under such rules and restrictions as the heads of the departments and bureaus mentioned may prescribe.

The activities of the University Center are for the present limited to the fields of history, political science, economics and statistics, and international law and diplomacy. Eventually it may develop into a residential center for investigators in all fields of learning.

In its present form the University Center represents the organization of a service rather than of an institution. For the rendering of this service the board of research advisers is organized in divisions each of which is composed of scholars who are qualified, by reason of their own researches, their familiarity with certain classes or groups of material, or their official positions, to render effective aid to investigators in certain fields of study. This aid takes the form of information respecting the location of desired material, assistance in securing access to it, and, in the case of graduate students, of advice respecting its utilization. It does not, however, include the giving of instruction, nor training in methods of investigation, nor supplying purely bibliographical information which should be available in any large library. It is assumed that graduate students who desire to work under the auspices of the University Center will already have received the instruction and training necessary to qualify them for work of research, and that they shall have reached a stage in their work where recourse to the collections in Washington has become essential to its further prosecution.

## OPPORTUNITY FOR RESEARCH IN WASHINGTON

It is unnecessary to dwell at length on the opportunity for research in Washington. In those fields of study to which the service of the University Center is for the present limited this opportunity is unequalled, as indeed it is also in many other fields. The administrative and technical archives of the various services of the Federal Government are indispensable to the student of American history and politics. The collections of the Library of Congress, especially in its divisions of manuscripts and of public documents can not be duplicated, and there are numerous smaller libraries, such as those of the Department of State, of the Department of Commerce, and of the Department of Labor, to mention only a few, which contain material specially collected and not readily available elsewhere. The location in Washington of such institutions or organizations as the Institute for Government Research, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, the American Society of International Law, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the Bureau of Railway Economics, the Carnegie Institution with its Department of Historical Research, and the American Historical Association, as well as the remarkable extension during the last two decades of economic and statistical research within the Government services have made the Capital one of the most important centers in the United States for work in the social studies.

## REGULATIONS OF THE UNIVERSITY CENTER

The University Center is now ready to offer to investigators the services described above. It should be understood that access to governmental collections, especially to administrative archives, is subject to official regulation or discretion and can not be assumed. For this reason advance correspondence with respect to proposed investigations is desirable. The services of the University Center are rendered without charge or fee, subject to the following conditions:

I. *Students in graduate departments of American universities.*—Each student desiring to work in Washington under the auspices of the University Center must make direct application by letter to the secretary, stating briefly the subject of his investigation, the stage reached in it at the time of making application, and as definitely as possible the nature of the work which he proposes to do in Washington. This application must be accompanied by a statement from the dean of the school in which the student is enrolled to the effect that the proposed work in Washington is undertaken with the approval of the competent university authorities. It should also, if possible, be accompanied by a letter from the officer of instruction under whose direction the student is conducting his investigation, containing such information about the work as may be useful to the technical division of the board of research advisers to which the student may be assigned. Upon arrival in Washington the student must register at the office of the secretary, and must then call upon the member of the board of advisers to whom he shall have been referred. Advisers will keep a record of the work of students assigned to them and will make a report thereon to the secretary. A copy of the report on the work of each student will be sent to the dean of the school from which he comes.

II. *Students in foreign universities and other investigators.*—Students in foreign universities and other investigators who desire to avail themselves of the services of the University Center should make application by letter to the secretary, stating the nature of the work which they propose to do in Washington. Upon arrival they should register at the office of the secretary and will be referred to the appropriate member of the board of research advisers. No record will be kept of their work nor will any report be made on it.

## REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON NOMINATIONS

Your committee on nominations in compliance with the requirements of the by-laws report the following nominations for the elective offices and committee memberships of the association for the ensuing year:

President, Charles H. Haskins.  
First vice president, Edward P. Cheyney.  
Second vice president, Woodrow Wilson.  
Secretary, John Spencer Bassett.  
Treasurer, Charles Moore.  
Executive council:

Arthur L. Cross.  
Sidney B. Fay.  
Carl Russell Fish.  
Carlton J. H. Hayes.  
Frederic L. Paxson.  
Ruth Putnam.  
James T. Shotwell.  
St. George L. Sioussat.

## Committee on nominations:

William E. Dodd.  
Henry E. Bourne.  
William E. Lingelbach.  
Nellie Neilson.  
William L. Westermann.

By way of explanation it should be stated that a distinguished member of the association withdrew his name from consideration by the committee when he learned that an active campaign had been made in behalf of his nomination for one of the offices within the gift of the association. No new nominations are made for the executive council because of the fact that no present

member of the council has as yet served three years. In accordance with the established practice, three members of the committee on nominations have been continued by the retiring chairman upon his own responsibility and without consulting the remainder of the committee.

Respectfully submitted.

F. H. HODDER, *Chairman.*

ELOISE ELLERY.

WILLIAM E. DODD.

HENRY E. BOURNE.

W. E. LINGELBACH.

#### REPORT OF THE COUNCIL COMMITTEE ON AGENDA

The committee met at the Columbia University Club, New York, on November 26, 1921, in two sessions, 10 a. m. to 1 p. m. and 2 to 5.20 p. m. Present: Messrs. Cheyney, Cross, Fay, Haskins, Hayes, Moore, Paxson, and Bassett. The following report is arranged in two sections, in accordance with the vote of the committee.

##### *Part I*

The following matters were discussed and disposed of by the committee in the manner indicated:

The secretary presented an appeal for moral support from the representative of the unrecognized Republic of Galicia in behalf of several learned societies of Galicia. No action was taken.

The secretary presented a letter from D. Francisco Yela, of Lerida, Spain, offering to sell to the association for publication the manuscript of his history of Spain before the independence of the United States. The secretary was instructed to reply that the association has no funds with which to publish such a work.

The secretary communicated for information the proposal of Mr. R. H. Lee, counsel of the Associated Advertising Clubs of the World, 110 West Fortieth Street, New York, to investigate and deal with doubtful publishing enterprises. The letter was placed on file.

At the request of Mr. Gaillard Hunt, the secretary was instructed to mention in his report to the business meeting the prizes for original studies in American history offered by the Knights of Columbus.

It was voted to place on file the request of Mr. Arthur MacDonald that the association petition Congress to place all the scientific bureaus of the Government under the jurisdiction of the Smithsonian Institution.

It was voted to request the committee on local arrangements to appoint a committee on publicity for the meeting in St. Louis, and that such a committee shall be a fixed feature of the committee on local arrangements in the future.

It was voted that the meeting of the council at St. Louis begin at 8 p. m., December 27, at the Planters Hotel, and continue the following morning.

The treasurer submitted his report, which was accepted and referred to the council.

The following reports of committees were considered and disposed of in the manner indicated:

The report of the Public Archives Commission was read and placed on file.

The report of the committee on the Herbert Baxter Adams prize was read and placed on file.

The report of the editor of the *Historical Outlook* was read and placed on file.

Mr. E. P. Cheyney reported in person for the committee on bibliography of English history, showing that progress is being made, and, after formal suggestions, it was voted to place the report on file.

Mr. J. F. Jameson reported in writing for the committee on national archives and asked that one more memorial be sent to Congress for an archives building. It was voted that Mr. Jameson be asked to prepare such a memorial.

Mr. J. F. Jameson reported in writing for the committee on documentary historical publications. This report was approved and placed on file.

Mr. J. F. Jameson reported in writing for the committee on transcripts from foreign archives. The report was approved and placed on file. His request to be relieved from chairmanship of the committee was referred to the committee on appointments acting in consultation with Mr. Charles Moore.

The report of Mr. J. F. Jameson for the committee on service was approved and placed on file.

Mr. W. G. Leland's report for the committee on railroad rates, showing that reduced rates have been obtained on most of the roads, provided 350 persons buy tickets, was approved and placed on file.

The report of Mr. Dixon Ryan Fox, chairman of the committee on hereditary patriotic societies, was approved and placed on file.

At the request of M. Jusserand, chairman, it was voted to continue the committee on the writing of history for another year.

The report of the secretary of the conference of historical societies was approved and placed on file.

### *Part II*

The following matters after discussion were referred to the council for consideration and final action:

It was voted to recommend to the council that the publication of the Austin Papers, proceeding under the direction of the committee on publications, be suspended at the end of Volume III.

The report of Mr. W. G. Leland for the committee on the disposition of the records of the association was placed on the docket with recommendation for its approval.

The committee considered the suggestion of the chairman of the committee on program to have an Anglo-American Historical Conference in 1922. It was the opinion of the committee that it is too early for such a conference, but they suggested that the council consider steps to revive the International Congress of Historical Studies.

The suggestion by Mr. W. K. Boyd for the creation of a committee on research was referred to Messrs. C. J. H. Hayes and E. P. Cheyney with the request that a report be made to the council at the next meeting.

The communication from Mr. J. T. Gerould was referred to the committee on bibliography for report at the next council meeting. The attention of the committee was called to the section in the recent report of the committee on policy referring to a check list of historical materials in American libraries.

It was voted to recommend the acceptance of the invitation of Yale University and the New Haven Colony Historical Society to hold the annual meeting of 1922 in New Haven and that the meeting of 1923 should be in the Middle West.

It was voted to refer the request of the Peoples of America Society to the council at its next meeting and that Mr. F. L. Paxson and the secretary investigate and report at that meeting.

The following reports of committees were referred to the council for further action as specified:

Mr. J. F. Jameson, reporting for the board of editors of the *American Historical Review*, stated that the Macmillan Co. wished the price of the *Review* to remain at 70 cents a copy during the coming year. It was voted to ask the board to report to the council on steps taken to increase the advertising in the *Review*.

It was voted to ask Mr. D. C. Munro to report to the council on the project for establishing studies in European history.

Mr. H. B. Learned reported in person for the committee on publications. It was voted to ask the committee to report to the council a policy for the distribution of the unbound copies of the prize essays in order to obviate the necessity of destruction. The committee was asked to see if a limit was not fixed on the amount of matter the association would publish in a prize essay. This request was made in connection with the Adams prize essay, 1917, which remains unpublished.

Mr. S. B. Fay reported in person for the committee on bibliography with information on the progress of work on the handbook. The committee was requested to prepare a statement for the next meeting of the council.

The report of the committee on the preparation of rules for administering the George Louis Beer prize, Mr. W. A. Dunning, chairman, was approved and placed on the docket for the next meeting of the council.

The report of Mr. W. G. Leland, representing this association in the joint committee on creating a university center in Washington, was submitted by the secretary. It was voted to place the matter on the docket and that the secretary inquire more particularly of the association's representative as to the place of history in the proposed project in relation to the historical work of the Carnegie Institution. The secretary was instructed to send a copy of the proposed constitution of the center to each member of the council.

The secretary presented the report of Mr. Henry Johnson, chairman of the committee on history in the schools. The matter was put on the docket for the next meeting of the council, and the secretary was instructed to write to Mr. Johnson and suggest that he propose that money be appropriated by some interested foundation for a survey of history in the schools.

The committee adjourned at 5.20 p. m.

JOHN S. BASSETT, *Secretary*.

---

#### MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION, HELD AT THE PLANTERS HOTEL, ST. LOUIS, MO., DECEMBER 27, 1921

The council met at 8 p. m. Present: Vice president Haskins, presiding; Messrs. Cross, Fay, Fish, Hayes, Jameson, Moore, Paxson, Sioussat, and Bassett, secretary. There also attended Mr. Max Farrand and Mr. D. C. Munro.

The secretary presented his report, which it was voted to accept.

The secretary was authorized to express thanks to Mr. T. J. Wertenbaker for his services as chairman of the committee on membership.

The treasurer presented his report, which it was voted to accept.

The secretary requested that the presentation of the report of the Pacific Coast Branch be postponed until a later meeting.

The secretary communicated to the council the proposal of Mr. R. H. Lee, counsel for the Associated Advertising Clubs of the World, to deal with doubtful publications.

The following memorial respecting an archives building offered by Mr. J. F. Jameson was adopted by the council:

For 13 years, beginning in 1908, a committee of the American Historical Association has annually urged upon Congress the erection of a suitable national archive building in Washington, in which the records and papers of the Government, now kept in a hundred different repositories, mostly unfit and unsafe, may be preserved in safety, arranged in good order, found rapidly, and consulted with ease.

During that time Congress has authorized the erection of the building and provided for preliminary plans, and the Public Buildings Commission has selected a site, but the recommendations and estimates annually submitted by the Treasury have not thus far been followed by any appropriations for purchase of site or beginning of construction.

Meanwhile, during these 13 years, and especially since the beginning of the World War, the situation has grown far worse and calls more loudly for remedy. The material needing to be preserved—partly in the interest of history, but much more largely in the interest of the Government as a business organization, whose papers represent great sums of money—has increased very largely in amount. A larger number of unsuitable places have been pressed into service to receive the overflow. Thus the records and papers of the American Expeditionary Forces in France and all those of The Adjutant General's Office relating to all previous wars are kept in a building not fireproof. Another collection, representing many millions of dollars in recent tax claims, lies in the basement of a theater in Washington. Government papers stored elsewhere in the United States or at our legations abroad are in quite as bad case, exposed to fire and destruction. And the rent annually paid for unsuitable quarters in Washington would pay interest on the cost of the finest national archive building in the world.

In the interest of security, in the interest of economy, in the interest of system, in the interest of the rapid and efficient conduct of the public business, and, not least, in the interest of American history, the council of the American Historical Association respectfully urges Congress to make at this present session an adequate appropriation for at least the purchase of the site for the national archive building.

Mr. Jameson was authorized to sign the names of the councillors present to the above.

Part I of the report of the committee on agenda was accepted without further discussion (see report).

After discussion of the report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission it was voted that the editor of the Austin Papers be notified that the council, on the basis of its present information, is not prepared to recommend the publication of anything beyond the third volume.

The report of the chairman of the committee on history teaching in the schools was presented. Mr. Farrand, representing the Commonwealth Fund, was present and discussed the situation. The council voted that it recommend that the directors of the Commonwealth Fund make an appropriation of \$10,000 a year for two years for a study of the present status of instruction in history and the other social studies.

Mr. D. C. Munro reported on the National Council of Teachers of Social Studies. It was voted that: (1) The council of the American Historical Association is in sympathy with the movement undertaken by the National Council of Teachers of Social Studies to bring about cooperation in the framing of a program for the teaching of history and the social sciences; (2) that our committee on history teaching in the schools be asked to take an active part in this cooperative movement; (3) that the committee be informed that in the judgment of the council this cooperation can best be permanently obtained through a council or joint body embracing representatives of the subjects and interests involved, rather than through the creation of a new

and independent organization; (4) that the committee on history teaching be directed to report its action to the council at its next meeting.

It was voted that the council recommend to the association that the annual meeting of 1922 be held in New Haven, with the expectation of meeting in Columbus in 1923. It was voted that the secretary inform Mr. Morgan P. Robinson that the association receives with thanks the invitation to meet in Richmond in 1924 and that careful consideration will be given to it when the council comes to a discussion of the matter.

On the request of the committee on agenda the council voted that expenses to be allowed should include necessary railway and Pullman fares.

It was voted to approve the report of Mr. Leland for the special committee on the disposition of records and that the committee be discharged.

The request of the committee on agenda that the council should consider means of reviving the International Congress of Historical Studies was presented, and further consideration of the matter was postponed.

The report of the subcommittee on research, appointed by the committee on agenda, was submitted by Mr. Carlton J. H. Hayes. The report<sup>1</sup> was adopted subject to modifications of details by Mr. E. P. Cheyney.

The council adjourned to meet at 9.30 a. m. Wednesday.

#### SECOND SESSION

The council met at 10 a. m. Present: Vice President Haskins, presiding; Messrs. Cross, Fay, Fish, Hayes, Jameson, McLaughlin, Moore, Paxson, Sioussat, and Bassett, secretary. There was also present Mr. D. C. Munro.

The subcommittee appointed by the committee on agenda to consider the Peoples of America Society reported that definite information had not been obtained from Mr. Morris R. Cohen. It was voted to authorize the same committee to continue in charge of the subject with power to dispose of it.

The committee on bibliography reported on the proposition made by Mr. T. J. Gerould. The report was accepted, and it was voted that the association approve the principle of such a survey, and that the committee on bibliography report its intended action at a later meeting of the council.

The report of the committee on agenda in regard to advertising matter in the American Historical Review was considered. The secretary submitted correspondence from Mr. G. S. Ford showing that the publishers are taking steps to increase such advertising.

Mr. D. C. Munro reported for the special committee on the publication of studies in European history. The report was accepted and the committee was discharged. The committee on appointments was requested to nominate a board of editors of the proposed "Studies."

Mr. D. C. Munro reported for the committee on the establishment of a university center in Washington. The report was received and the special committee was discharged. It was voted to establish a standing committee on the university center, consisting of five members, to keep in touch with the movement and report regarding it to the council.

Mr. S. B. Fay presented a report from the committee on bibliography respecting the Guide to Historical Literature. The report was accepted. It was voted that mention of the committee on bibliography be omitted from the title page, and that the words "general editors" be inserted. It was voted that \$500 be allowed the committee on bibliography with the understanding that it should be returned from the proceeds of the sales.

---

<sup>1</sup> See pages 71-72.

The report of the special committee on rules to govern the competition for the George Louis Beer prize was received and adopted, and the committee was discharged. It was voted to create a standing committee of five for the award of this prize.

The consideration of the report of the committee on publications was postponed until the next meeting of the council, Friday, December 30.

Mr. C. H. Haskins made a report from the American Council of Learned Societies. The report was received. It was voted to reelect Mr. Haskins as delegate from this association in the Council of Learned Societies for the term ending in 1925.

The secretary presented a letter from Mr. Joseph Schafer in regard to the problem of conserving material relating to the history of the war brought back by members of the different units of the American Expeditionary Forces. It was voted that the letter be referred to the committee on military history.

The report of Col. Oliver L. Spaulding, of the Army War College, acting chairman of the committee on military history, was received and accepted.

The council adjourned until Friday at 9.30 a. m.

---

#### MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION, HELD AT THE PLANTERS HOTEL, ST. LOUIS, MO., DECEMBER 30, 1921

The meeting was called to order at 9.30. Present: Vice President Haskins, presiding; Messrs. Cross, Hayes, Jameson, Moore, Paxson, Sioussat, and Bassett, secretary. Mr. H. B. Learned, chairman of the committee on publications, was also present.

It was voted that a formal vote of thanks be extended to the following organizations: The St. Louis Club, the City Club, the University Club, the Planters Hotel, the American Hotel Annex, Washington University, the Missouri Botanical Garden, the Missouri Historical Society, the St. Louis Convention, Publicity and Tourists Bureau, and the committee on local arrangements.

The resolution adopted by the conference on medieval history requesting the creation of a committee to assist in promoting the revision of Du Cange's *Glossarium* was received from Mr. L. M. Larson. It was voted to refer it to the Council of Learned Societies.

The following resolution was presented from the conference on the teaching of history in the schools:

That this section request the council of the American Historical Association to ask the College Entrance Examination Board to prepare a set of questions based on the division of the field into early European and modern European history, offering students an option to the present examination which is based on the division proposed by the committee of seven.

The resolution was accepted subject to the approval of the committee on the teaching of history in the schools.

It was voted to appoint two delegates to the National Council of Teachers of Social Studies.

Mr. H. B. Learned presented the report of the committee on publications. It was voted that the report be accepted with the additional recommendation that announcement be made at the annual business meeting in regard to the disposition of unbound publications, and that the committee on publications be asked to report more fully next year respecting this matter.

Mr. Learned presented the question of the advisability of printing the Herbert Baxter Adams prize essay of 1917 at this time. He stated that the Durham Printery estimated the expense of printing 300 copies at about \$750, and recommended that the essay be published. It was voted that the committee be authorized to expend \$750 for the publication of the essay, with the understanding that as much as possible of the expense be borne by the budget of 1923.

The secretary presented the report of the committee on appointments, and, after consideration by the council, the following appointments were made and ordered to be announced in the annual business meeting:

#### STANDING COMMITTEES

(The names of new members are italicized)

*Committee on program for the thirty-seventh annual meeting.*—David S. Muzzey, chairman (term expires in 1922); Wilbur H. Siebert (1922), Eloise Ellery (1924). (The other members of the committee are: Charles Seymour, appointed in 1920 for the term expiring in 1922; Walter L. Fleming, appointed in 1920 for the term expiring in 1923; and, ex officio, Nils Andreas Olsen, secretary of the Agricultural History Society, and John C. Parish, secretary of the Conference of Historical Societies.)

*Committee on local arrangements, thirty-seventh annual meeting.*—Max Farrand, chairman.

*Board of editors of the American Historical Review.*—William E. Dodd (to serve six years from January 1, 1922).

*Historical manuscripts commission.*—Justin H. Smith, chairman; Annie H. Abel, Eugene C. Barker, Robert P. Brooks, Logan Esarey, Gaillard Hunt.

*Committee on the Justin Winsor prize.*—Issac J. Cox, chairman; C. S. Boucher, Thomas F. Moran, Bernard C. Steiner, C. Mildred Thompson.

*Committee on the Herbert Baxter Adams prize.*—Conyers Read, chairman; Charles H. McIlwain, Nellie Neilson, Louis J. Paetow, Bernadotte E. Schmitt, Wilbur H. Sieberl.

*Committee on publications* (all ex officio except the chairman).—B. Barrett Learned, chairman; Allen R. Boyd, secretary; John S. Bassett, J. Franklin Jameson, Justin H. Smith, Herbert A. Kellar.

*Committee on membership.*—Louise Fargo Brown, chairman; Elizabeth Donnan, A. C. Krey, Frank Melvin, Richard A. Newhall, John W. Oliver, Charles W. Ramsdell, Arthur P. Scott, J. J. Van Nostrand, jr., James E. Winston.

*Conference of historical societies.*—John C. Parish, secretary.

*Committee on National Archives.*—J. Franklin Jameson, chairman; Gaillard Hunt, Charles Moore, Eben Putnam, Col. Oliver L. Spaulding, jr.

*Committee on bibliography.*—George M. Dutcher, chairman; Henry R. Shipman, acting chairman; William H. Allison, Sidney B. Fay, Augustus H. Shearer.

*Subcommittee on the bibliography of American travel.*—Solon J. Buck, Homer C. Hockett, M. M. Quaife.

*Public Archives Commission.*—Victor H. Paltsits, chairman; Solon J. Buck, John H. Edmonds, Robert Burton House, Waldo G. Leland.

*Committee on obtaining transcripts from foreign archives.*—Charles M. Andrews, chairman; Gaillard Hunt, Waldo G. Leland.

*Committee on military history.*—Brig. Gen. Eben Swift, chairman; Allen R. Boyd, Thomas R. Hay, Eben Putnam, Col. Oliver L. Spaulding, jr., Lt. Col. Jennings C. Wise.

*Committee on hereditary patriotic societies.*—Dixon R. Fox, chairman; Natalie S. Lincoln, Harry Brent Mackoy, Mrs. Annie L. Sioussat, R. C. Ballard Thruston.

*Committee on service.*—J. Franklin Jameson, chairman; Elbert J. Benton, Clarence S. Brigham, Worthington C. Ford, *Stella Herron*, *Theodore D. Jervey*, *Louise Phelps Kellogg*, Albert E. McKinley, *Herbert I. Priestley*, James Sullivan. (The president and secretary authorized to appoint additional members.)

*Board of editors of the Historical Outlook.*—Edgar Dawson, Sarah A. Dynes, Daniel C. Knowlton, Laurence M. Larson, William L. Westermann.

*Committee on historical research in colleges.*—William K. Boyd, chairman; *E. Morton Coulter*, Benjamin B. Kendrick, *Asa E. Martin*, William W. Sweet.

*Committee on the George Louis Beer prize.*—Bernadotte E. Schmitt, chairman; George H. Blakeslee, Robert H. Lord, Jesse S. Reeves, Mason W. Tyler.

*Committee on history teaching in the schools.*—Guy Stanton Ford, chairman; Henry E. Bourne, Philip P. Chase, Henry Johnson, Daniel C. Knowlton, Albert E. McKinley, Arthur M. Schlesinger, Eugene M. Violette.

*Representatives in National Council of Teachers of Social Studies.*—Henry Johnson, Arthur M. Schlesinger.

*Delegate in American Council of Learned Societies.*—Charles H. Haskins (term expires in 1925).

*Committee on endowment.*—Charles Moore, chairman. (The chairman authorized to appoint additional members.)

#### SPECIAL COMMITTEES

*Committee on bibliography of modern English history.*—Edward P. Cheyney, chairman; Arthur L. Cross, Roger B. Merriman, Wallace Notestein, Conyers Read.

*Committee on the historical congress at Rio de Janeiro.*—John B. Stetson, jr., chairman; Percy A. Martin, vice chairman; James A. Robertson, secretary; Charles Lyon Chandler, Isaac J. Cox, Charles H. Cunningham, Julius Klein, Manoel de Oliveira Lima, Constantine E. McGuire, Edwin V. Morgan, William S. Schurz.

*Committee on the documentary historical publications of the United States.*—J. Franklin Jameson, chairman; Charles Moore.

*Committee on the writing of history.*—Ambassador Jean Jules Jusserand, chairman; John S. Bassett, secretary; Wilbur C. Abbott, Charles W. Colby.

*Committee to cooperate with The Peoples of America Society in the study of race elements in the United States.*—John S. Bassett, chairman; Frederic L. Paxson.

It was voted that the president and secretary should have power to make additional appointments to the above committees where no provision has been made. It was voted that any member of the association intending to visit South America during the session of the approaching congress at Rio de Janeiro may be added to the committee on the said congress by authority of the president.

A report of progress from the Pacific Coast Branch was presented verbally by Mr. Robert C. Clark, delegate from the branch.

It was voted that in the opinion of the council the next meeting of the association should begin not earlier than Wednesday morning, December 27, and should close not later than Saturday noon, December 30, and that the business meeting should be held earlier than the final session, and that the council should seek, if possible, to have two sessions in advance of the opening meeting of the association, subject to arrangement by the secretary.

It was voted to approve the following budget as presented by the committee on finance:

## APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1923

Secretary and treasurer-----	\$3, 000
Pacific Coast Branch-----	50
Committee on nominations-----	100
Committee on membership-----	100
Committee on program-----	300
Committee on local arrangements-----	50
Conference of historical societies-----	25
Committee on publications-----	700
Council committee on agenda-----	300
American Historical Review-----	7, 000
Historical manuscripts commission-----	20
Herbert Baxter Adams prize-----	200
Writings on American History-----	200
American Council of Learned Societies-----	150
Committee on bibliography-----	500
Committee on the writing of history-----	75
	<hr/>
	12, 770

## ESTIMATED INCOME

Annual dues-----	\$7, 000
Registration fees-----	150
Publications-----	100
Royalties-----	50
Interest-----	1, 400
Miscellaneous-----	50
	<hr/>
	8, 750

It was voted to approve the investments of the endowment fund made by the treasurer.

The council adjourned.

# PROCEEDINGS OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ADOPTED BY CORRESPONDENCE WITH MEMBERS

## APPOINTMENTS TO COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL

*Committee on agenda.*—Charles H. Haskins, chairman (ex officio); Edward P. Cheyney (ex officio), Woodrow Wilson (ex officio), John S. Bassett (ex officio), Charles Moore (ex officio), Arthur L. Cross, Sidney B. Fay, Carlton J. H. Hayes, Frederic L. Paxson.

*Committee on meetings and relations.*—John S. Bassett, chairman; Edward Channing, Carl Russell Fish, James T. Shotwell, Ruth Putnam.

*Committee on finance.*—Charles Moore, chairman; John S. Bassett, Sidney B. Fay, Frederic L. Paxson, St. George L. Sioussat.

*Committee on appointments.*—Charles H. Haskins, chairman; John S. Bassett, Edward P. Cheyney, Carl Russell Fish, Carlton J. H. Hayes.

## APPOINTMENTS TO STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE ASSOCIATION

*Committee on the University Center in Washington.*—J. F. Jameson, chairman; Gaillard Hunt, H. B. Learned, W. G. Leland, Charles Moore.

*Board of editors, studies in European history.*—George B. Adams, chairman; Arthur E. R. Boak, Robert H. Lord, Wallace Notestein, James Westfall Thompson.

## APPOINTMENTS TO SPECIAL COMMITTEES OF THE ASSOCIATION

*Committee on the Brussels Historical Congress.*—J. Franklin Jameson, chairman; Clarence W. Alvord, Carl Russell Fish, Tenney Frank, Waldo G. Leland, James T. Shotwell, Paul Van Dyke.

REGISTER OF ATTENDANCE AT THE THIRTY-SIXTH ANNUAL  
MEETING OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION, ST.  
LOUIS, MO.

## A

Aiton, Arthur S.  
Allen, Mary Bernard.  
Alvord, C. W.  
Alvord, Idress Head.  
Anderson, Frank Maloy.  
Andrews, George Gordon.  
Appleton, Wm. W.

## B

Babcock, Kendric  
Charles.  
Baldwin, Alice M.  
Barclay, Thomas S.  
Barnes, Harry E.  
Bassett, John S.  
Bates, F. S.  
Bates, W. H.  
Bond, B. W., jr.  
Becker, Carl.  
Benjamin, Gilbert Gid-  
dings.  
Benns, F. Lee.  
Benson, Clement L.  
Betten, Rev. Francis S.  
Bieber, Ralph Paul.  
Bishop, Frances L.  
Bishop, J. H.  
Blegen, Theodore C.  
Bliss, Marguerite.  
Bliss, W. E.  
Boak, A. E. R.  
Bolton, Herbert E.  
Boucher, C. S.  
Bourne, H. E.  
Bourne, Mrs. H. E.  
Bowden, Witt.  
Boyd, Ivy T. (Mrs. S. A.)  
Brand, Carl F.  
Brandt, W. I.  
Breasted, James H.  
Breckenridge, Wm.  
Clark.  
Brookes, Jean Ingram.  
Brown, Samuel Hulme.  
Buck, Solon J.

## C

Caffrey, Genevieve E.  
Cain, Rev. Mark A.

Carroll, E. M.  
Carson, W. W.  
Carter, C. E.  
Chase, Wayland J.  
Clark, Chester Wells.  
Clark, Olynthus B.  
Clark, Robert Carlton.  
Cleven, N. Andrew N.  
Cline, Pierce.  
Cochran, W. C.  
Cole, Arthur C.  
Colgate, Lathrop.  
Collord, J. H.  
Comstock, Grace E.  
Conger, John Leonard.  
Connelley, William E.  
Couiter, E. Merton.  
Cox, Isaac J.  
Crandall, Andrew W.  
Crane, Verner W.  
Cross, Arthur Lyon.

## D

Dale, Edward Everett.  
Davidson, Roy.  
Demarest, Elizabeth B.  
Dietz, Fred. C.  
Dodd, William E.  
Douglass, R. S.  
Dow, Earle W.  
Dunbar, Louise Burn-  
ham.  
Duncalf, Frederic.  
Dunlap, Blanche Ger-  
mond.  
Dunning, Wm. A.

## E

Eagleton, Clyde.  
Earle, Edward M.  
Edmonds, John H.  
Edwards, M. F.  
Edwards, Martha L.  
Ellery, Eloise.

## F

Farr, Shirley.  
Farrand, Max.  
Faÿ, Bernard.  
Fay, Sidney B.

Fellows, George Emory.  
Fish, Carl Russell.  
Fisse, Edna.  
Fling, Fred Morrow.  
Ford, Guy Stanton.  
Foster, Henry A.  
Foster, Herbert D.  
Fox, Dixon Ryan.  
Frayser, William A.  
Fuller, Joseph V.

## G

Galpin, W. Freeman.  
Gardner, Clara.  
Garraghan, Rev. Gilbert  
J.  
Gewehr, Wesley M.  
Gibbons, Lois Oliphant.  
Gilbert, Mary Jane.  
Gillespie, James E.  
Gipson, Laurence H.  
Gochenauer, J. Scott.  
Godard, George S.  
Goodwin, Cardinal.  
Goodykoontz, Colin B.  
Gras, Norman S. B.  
Greene, Evarts B.  
Grose, Clyde Leclare.  
Guérard, Albert L.  
Guilday, Rev. Peter.

## H

Hackett, Charles Wilson.  
Haddaway, A. S.  
Hale, Philip H.  
Hall, Dana W.  
Hamilton, Leland S.  
Hamsher, Frank.  
Harlan, E. R.  
Hartsough, Mildred.  
Haskins, Charles H.  
Hayes, Carlton J. H.  
Hazen, Charles Downer.  
Healy, Patrick J.  
Hedger, Geo. A.  
Helble, Herbert H.  
Hewes, Edwin B.  
Hickey, Rev. Edward J.  
Hicks, John D.  
Hiemenz, Hilda E.

Higby, Chester P.  
 Himrod, James L.  
 Hirsch, Arthur H.  
 Hodder, F. H.  
 House, R. B.  
 Hubbard, H. C.  
 Hulbert, Archer Butler.  
 Hunt, Gaillard.  
 Huss, Genevieve.  
 Huth, Carl F., jr.

## I

Irby, Louise.

## J

Jackson, W. C.  
 Jameson, John Franklin.  
 Janson, Florence E.  
 Jenison, Ernestine.  
 Jenison, Marguerite E.  
 Jernegan, Marcus W.  
 Johnson, Winifred.  
 Jones, Guernsey.  
 Jones, Paul V. B.  
 Joranson, Einar.  
 Jordan, Henry Donaldson.  
 Jordan, John Harry.

## K

Kellar, Herbert A.  
 Kerner, Robert J.  
 Kinchen, Oscar A.  
 Kingsbury, Joseph Lyman.  
 Klem, Mary J.  
 Kline, Allen M.  
 Klingenhagen, Anna M.  
 Klinger, A. Conn.  
 Koch, Julie Frotscher.  
 Kohlmeier, A. L.  
 Knowlton, Daniel C.  
 Krausnick, Gertrude.  
 Krey, A. C.

## L

La Follette, Robert.  
 Lanza, Col. C. H.  
 Lapham, Martha.  
 Lapham, Ruth.  
 Larson, Laurence M.  
 Latourette, K. S.  
 Lauer, Ernest.

Laughlin, S. B.  
 Leader, Herman.  
 Learned, H. Barrett.  
 Leebrick, K. C.  
 Lechliler, L. L.  
 Lewis, John James.  
 Lingley, Charles R.  
 Lomax, Charlotte H.  
 Lonn, Ella.  
 Lord, Robert Howard.  
 Lunt, W. E.  
 Lynch, William O.

## M

McCarthy, Charles H.  
 McElmeel, Joseph F.  
 McGrane, Reginald Charles.  
 McLaughlin, A. C.  
 McLean, Ross H.  
 McMartin, Adaline.  
 McMurry, Donald L.  
 Mahan, Bruce E.  
 Malin, James C.  
 Marion, W. E.  
 Marsh, Edward C.  
 Marsh, Frank Burr.  
 Marsh, S. Louise (Mrs Eugene).  
 Martin, A. E.  
 Mecham, John Lloyd.  
 Melvin, Frank E.  
 Mereness, Newton D.  
 Metzger, Charles H.  
 Middlebush, Frederick A.  
 Miller, Rex.  
 Mitchell, Margaret J.  
 Moody, V. Alton.  
 Moon, Parker Thomas.  
 Moore, Charles.  
 Moore, John Norwood.  
 Morgan, DeWitt S.  
 Morgan, W. T.  
 Morison, Samuel E.  
 Morrow, Ethel.  
 Morton, Joy.  
 Munro, Dana C.  
 Munro, Mrs. Dana C.

## N

Neuhoff, Dorothy A.  
 Newcombe, Alfred W.  
 Nixon, Herman C.  
 Notestein, Wallace.

## O

Oestreich, Thomas.  
 Oldfather, C. H.  
 Oliver, John W.  
 Olmstead, A. T.  
 Olmstead, Mabel.  
 Owen, Mrs. Marie Banthead.

## P

Packard, Laurence B.  
 Paetow, L. J.  
 Page, Alice E.  
 Page, Edward C.  
 Paine, Mrs. C. S.  
 Paine, Linn.  
 Paltsits, Victor Hugo.  
 Parish, John C.  
 Patterson, David L.  
 Paullin, C. O.  
 Paxson, Frederic L.  
 Pease, Theodore C.  
 Pelzer, Louis.  
 Pence, Gwen Jones.  
 Perkins, Clarence.  
 Pettus, Charles P.  
 Pfeiffer, Laura B.  
 Phelps, Dawson.  
 Pierce, Bessie L.  
 Pierson, W. W.  
 Pite, Arthur.  
 Poage, Geo. R.  
 Price, Emma L.  
 Prichard, Walter.  
 Priddy, Mrs. Bessie Leach.  
 Priestley, Herbert I.

## Q

Quaife, M. M.

## R

Rammelkamp, C. H.  
 Ramsdell, Charles W.  
 Randall, J. G.  
 Renich, Katharine.  
 Reuter, Bertha Ann.  
 Riedel, Lucile.  
 Rippy, J. Fred.  
 Roberts, A. Sellev.  
 Robertson, W. S.  
 Robinson, Howard.  
 Robinson, Morgan P.

Roll, Charles.

Root, W. T.

Rostovtzeff, Michael T.

Rowse, Edward F.

Runyon, Laura L.

## S

Sabine, George H.

Santo, Hisata Asbury.

Schafer, Joseph.

Schevill, Ferdinand.

Schmitt, Bernadotte E.

Schlesinger, A. M.

Seal, H. C.

Severance, Frank H.

Shearer, Augustus H.

Sheldon, Mrs. Paul B.

Shipman, Henry R.

Shoemaker, Floyd C.

Simmons, Lucy.

Sioussat, St. George L.

Smith, Eudora.

Sontag, Raymond J.

Spielman, W. Carl.

Staples, Thomas S.

Stephens, F. F.

Stephenson, Carl

Stevens, Wayne E.

Stevenson, Sarah C.

Stiles, C. C.

Stine, O. C.

Stone, Mary Hanchett.

Sullivan, James.

Surrey, F. M.

Surrey, N. M. Miller.

Swanson, F. C.

Sweet, Alfred H.

Sweet, William W.

## T

Thomas, Shipley.

Thomas, S. E.

Thompson, James West-  
fall.

Thorndike, Lynn.

Thruston, R. C. Ballard.

Tillman, F. P.

Trenholme, Norman M.

Trotter, Reginald G.

Tryon, R. M.

Tu, Simon C.

Tucker, H. R.

Tuthill, Edward.

Tyler, Clarence G.

## U

Ulrick, Laura F.

Usher, Roland G.

## V

Vical, Charles.

Viles, Jonas.

Violette, E. M.

## W

Wagoner, Mrs. Adeline  
Palmier.

Wander, Otto.

Westermann, W. L.

White, Laura A.

White, Melvin Johnson.

Willard, James F.

Wilson, J. Scott.

Wood, George Arthur.

Wrench, J. E.

Wulfing, J. M.

Wyckoff, Charles T.

## Z

Zéligzon, Maurice.

---

---

II. PROCEEDINGS OF THE SEVENTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING  
OF THE PACIFIC COAST BRANCH OF THE AMERICAN  
HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

---

PORTLAND, OREGON, NOVEMBER 25-26, 1921

---

---



## PROCEEDINGS OF THE SEVENTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE PACIFIC COAST BRANCH OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

Reported by WILLIAM A. MORRIS, *Acting Secretary-Treasurer*

The seventeenth annual meeting of the Pacific Coast Branch of the American Historical Association was held at the Multnomah Hotel, Portland, Oreg., on Friday morning and afternoon and Saturday morning, November 25 and 26, 1921. The annual dinner at 6.30 o'clock Friday evening, also at the Multnomah Hotel, was in the nature of a joint meeting with the Oregon Historical Society. Friday sessions were of a general nature, and Prof. Robert C. Clark, of the University of Oregon, president of the Pacific Coast Branch, was in the chair. The success of the meeting was in no small measure due to the program committee, consisting of W. C. Barnes, chairman, L. J. Paetow, P. A. Martin, Roy Malcom, Edward McMahon, and R. H. Down, and to the committee on arrangements, consisting of George L. Koehn, chairman, Olive Kuntz, and Charles McKinley. Despite severe storms and floods the attendance at the various sessions averaged about 35, all of the Pacific Coast States being represented, although some members from States farther east were storm bound. At the annual dinner 50 were present.

The opening session was called to order at 9.30 Friday morning by the president, who announced the appointment of committees, respectively, on nominations, resolutions, and auditing.

Ralph H. Lutz, of Stanford University, then delivered an address on "The manuscripts on eastern Europe in the Hoover War Library." This section of the Hoover War Library at Stanford University contains a number of important manuscripts which, either because of their confidential nature or late acquisition, were not included in the original report of Dr. E. D. Adams, the director of the collection. The paper on this subject dealt only with the manuscripts received from the Baltic States, Russia, Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria, Turkey, Armenia, and the French mandate in the Near East.

Under the heading Baltic States the Hoover War Library contains a number of memoranda written by statesmen and military leaders concerning the state of the former Baltic Provinces from 1914 to 1918. Included in this group is a great collection of Latvian manuscripts made by Alexander von Tobien. As a result of the efforts of

Prof. Frank A. Golder, the Hoover War Library possesses a complete set of copies of the famous Bermont documents captured by the Latvian Government from the army of Prince Avaloff Bermont, who operated in the Baltic regions after the armistice in conjunction with the Germans.

Among the Bulgarian materials is the memoir of Theodore Shipkoff, which reveals the private negotiations between American agents and Bulgarians in Switzerland during the latter part of the war. In general this particular type of literature will be of great value to the student of the problems which arose out of the World War.

The paper presented by William A. Morris, of the University of California, on King John, the sheriffs, and Magna Carta dealt with the functions and status of the English sheriff. It emphasized especially the shrievalty as an arm of a strong absolutism. The close rolls of the period, so it was stated, convey the impression that at times a great part of the ordinary administration was carried on by orders to the various sheriffs. These officials were collectors of both the king's ordinary dues and of special impositions, the latter of great constitutional importance for this period. The system under which the king drew on the sheriff all sorts of requisitions for money, supplies, and the sustenance of various officials sent to the counties, of his men, hostages, and grooms, as well as his horses and falcons, was now at its height. In various counties the sheriff was custodian of a royal castle, and his duties in enforcing the military service due the king and in furnishing supplies for military purposes were numerous and important. Already he was being ordered to make various proclamations in accord with the king's directions. The familiar form of commission issued in later times at his appointment is first found in this reign. The men of a shire sometimes bartered with the king for the removal of a bad sheriff. This official incurred hatred as the agent of a vicious fiscal system and of the king's measures against the church. He was, however, by no means the unwilling agent of a bad régime, and the opinion which regards him as a local tyrant is well founded. This is prominently borne out by sections of Magna Charta directed against him. Yet it is not true that John's sheriffs were as a class adventurers or foreigners. There were few of the latter before 1215, and sheriffs of the period on the average were superior to the men who constituted the king's council. It was the stress of the war with the barons which brought into the office mercenary captains. Until this period the cruelty and extortion of the native-born sheriff seem quite as great as in case of the foreigners. The conclusion drawn was that the known facts concerning the office tend to sustain the opinion which regards the reign

of John as one marked by organizing genius and, until the war with the barons, by administrative progress.

A paper by Dr. Olive Kuntz, of Reed College, on Tiberius Cæsar came next on the set program of the afternoon. The interpretations of Tiberius and of the Roman constitution during the transition period from the republic to the empire presented in this paper arose primarily out of an application of a new method of criticism and source analysis to the extant literary accounts of Tacitus, Suetonius, and Dio Cassius. This method was discovered and applied to materials covering the work of Augustus by Prof. Richard F. Scholz, but has not been presented in a published work.

According to the interpretation of Doctor Kuntz, Tiberius was the last champion of the cause of republicanism in Roman history. Much of the republicanism which has been accredited to Augustus resulted from the coming into control of Tiberius in 4 A. D., after the Augustan religious and political plans for a succession in their original form were defeated by the deaths of Gaius and Lucius Cæsar. The program of Tiberius included a complete reversal of the plan for a succession and the restoration through successive stages of the old republican constitution. In the face of centralizing tendencies working throughout the empire, the senate refused to cooperate with Tiberius. The opposition centered in an imperialist rather than a patrician group. A compromise with Augustan ideals was effected after the death of Germanicus and the trial of Gnaeus Piso. The death of his own son Drusus made Tiberius dependent upon minors in the Julian branch of the family of the Cæsars for possible successors. The opposition aroused against Sejanus, the only able supporter of Tiberius in his last years, centered in the imperialist Agrippina faction which was seeking a complete control of the succession.

A discussion by President Richard F. Scholz, of Reed College, followed, the speaker taking as his topic "The limitations of the Ancient Book." He held that our method of approaching ancient texts is wrong, for if we expect consistency in the Gospel or in Tacitus or Suetonius we are mistaken. In the Gospel it is not primarily a matter of historical truth but of literary unity. We are confusing history as composition with history as a search for truth. In the ancient world history was literature. The historian had a right to invent if he produced a better literary work. It makes a great difference whether he is doing a biography or an annal. If, like Tacitus, he writes an annal, he harmonizes the various accounts he finds by saying that either this or that was so. He uses connectives, such as "furthermore," "moreover," "straightway," in joining together the respective bits. The problem is not to watch

the texts but the scenes, to mark the transition from one source to another.

Another important limitation upon the ancient writer is that he had no historical mindedness. Mechanical difficulties were often in the way. He finds a thing and carries it back. St. Paul dictates, but does not write himself, as his postscripts show. Moreover, the ancient writer could not place a rejected account in a footnote. Modern writers, in dividing Paul's writings into chapter and verse, have made things much worse. Suetonius, a private secretary to Hadrian, used a card-index method. When the ancient writer shifts from one authority to another he gets his chronology wrong. In the ancient world there was no plagiarism, the content was everything that could be found.

In the general discussion which followed, Professor Lutz was asked whether the Hoover collection contains a complete collection of reports of the Supreme Council. He replied that the collection of reports is not yet complete, and that those on hand are still treated as confidential and have not been made accessible.

The session of Friday afternoon was marked by two departures from the printed program. Levi E. Young, of the University of Utah, who was to have presented a paper on "The settlement of the Great Basin by the Mormon people," was storm bound and unable to reach Portland. And in the absence of Edgar E. Robinson, of Stanford University, who was to have spoken on "Manifestations of party life in the British North American colonies," Percy A. Martin, of the same university, gave an address on "South America, its history and its historians."

Professor Martin held that South American history should be considered from a detached point of view; that we have envisaged it with a North American viewpoint or associated it with international law. The opinion that the political history is a gloomy matter is more or less justified as applied to the less consequential countries. But in at least three of these countries political development has been successfully achieved. In Argentina there was a struggle between centralization and federalism. Here there is secret voting and an influential public opinion in a very real sense. To Brazil a European monarchy was transported, the acclimation of a European dynasty occurred, the problems of political liberty arose. In Chile there have been practically no revolutions, and the pursuit of some program of importance is constantly to be recorded. But aside from political history, the transplantation of a European civilization, the problems of free land and free life, and, in Brazil, a westward movement, all claim attention. There are the economic and social problems of a vast expanse of territory, the problems of an inferior

population existing side by side with a white population. Ethnology and sociology offer further problems. Moreover dynamic, outstanding personalities like Bolivar and San Martin also demand attention.

The leading historians, again, belong to the three principal States. History writing is not associated with teaching, as in our country, for few South American universities have faculties of letters and science, and history is taught as part of the law curriculum. Moreover, historians are trained rather by practical politics than by the seminar. Bartolome Mitre is an example. Oliveira Lima is a diplomat. Chilean historians have nearly all figured in politics or have held cabinet positions. Thus partisan influence or bias enters. Moreover, they are almost uniformly extreme chauvinists. More recently there is an attempt to follow the canons of accuracy and truth. The influence of French culture, furthermore, leads some to try to describe South American society in terms of European society. Belief in the superiority of one's own constitution has also warped judgment. Finally, few writers have attempted a synthesis, and, as a consequence, we have few histories that may be regarded as final. Colonial history has been better described than that of the nineteenth century. Chile has done most to produce writers of eminence. There is in Chilean history something of logical unfolding. Older conditions have been translated into the Chilean constitution, and historians have reflected this orderly development.

The concluding portion of the address dealt with the work of some individual writers, the speaker holding that these bear comparison favorably with Motley, Prescott, and others of whom we are justly proud.

Samuel F. Bemis, of Whitman College, read the paper on "Jay's Treaty and the Northwest Boundary gap," which has since appeared as an article in the *American Historical Review*.<sup>1</sup> The speaker discussed the gap left in the northwestern boundary of the United States by reason of the geographically impossible terms of the treaty of peace of 1783, whereby the line was to run due west from the Lake of the Woods to the Mississippi. After the discovery by the British authorities that the source of the Mississippi was probably to the south of this line, a project was set on foot to rectify the boundary in that quarter in such a way as to bring a spur of British territory south to the "navigable waters" of the Mississippi.

Professor Bemis's paper followed the history of the *démarche*, particularly as revealed in the negotiations in London of John Jay, which ended in the treaty between the United States and Great Britain. The sources used for the preparation of the paper were the colonial and foreign office correspondence as preserved in the

---

<sup>1</sup> *American Historical Review*, April, 1922.

Public Record Office, the archives of the United States Government at Washington, some of the private papers of Lord Grenville, and papers from the Canada archives at Ottawa. The conclusion was that the failure of the rectification proposal was of great importance to the subsequent history of the American West, for it removed the danger of projecting the future northern boundary of Louisiana west from a starting point considerably to the south of the present international boundary, thus saving to the United States the present States of Dakota, Montana, Idaho, Washington, and parts of Minnesota and South Dakota.

Robert M. Gatke, of Willamette University, in the final paper of the afternoon dealt with "The first Indian school of the Pacific Northwest." This was the school established by the Methodist missionaries in the Willamette Valley in 1835. It was shown that at first it partook of the nature of an orphanage. The mission received more children than it could care for and they became diseased. There was no medical care other than simple household treatment until Dr. Elijah White was added to the mission force in 1837. The speaker took up the industrial activities of the Indian children, as well as the religious work of the institution, and devoted especial attention to Cyrus Shepard, a native of Acton, Mass., who was the chief worker until his death in 1840. In this year the mission was moved to Salem, and in June, 1844, the Indian school closed. The speaker held that the Victor-Bancroft judgment of the missionaries as engaged too largely in secular pursuits does not do them justice. In the course of the discussion which followed Mr. Joseph D. Lee, who knew Messrs. Leslie, Waller, and Hines, three of the early missionaries, told of one of the pupils of the mission school.

Professor Martin spoke of the need of a textbook for South American history, and also spoke of a bias of South American writers against the United States, stating that they are prone to regard Europe, and particularly France, as the source of their ideals, and have looked to the United States only as a source of prosperity. Garcia Calderon expressed the traditional attitude toward the United States. Only lately is there a realization that the United States has expressed ideals.

Mr. George H. Himes, curator of the Oregon Historical Association, announced that he was ready to show visitors the collections of the society.

At the business session which followed, the committee on resolutions, consisting of Oliver H. Richardson, chairman, and of Dean George H. Alden and Ralph H. Lutz, reported the following, which were adopted for communication to the press and in substance to the authorities as the president and secretary might decide:

*Whereas*, the costs of preparation for war have for many years past been placing upon the people of the earth enormous burdens; and

*Whereas*, armaments steadily tend to become more and more costly and to divert the wealth of the nations from normal processes of production and distribution such as are essential to a society which shall be materially prosperous and stable; and

*Whereas*, continuance in former lines of military and naval development tends to future wars which jeopardize civilization itself; for if armaments are the results of policy, it is likewise true that policies may be the results of armaments; be it therefore

*Resolved* by the members of the Pacific Coast Branch of the American Historical Association, assembled at Portland, Oreg., in its annual meeting, that we urge the President and Congress of the United States, and their representatives in the Conference for the Limitation of Armaments to strive, to the utmost of their power, to effect such an agreement among the nations as will reduce armies and navies to the smallest limits compatible with the maintenance of order; and be it further

*Resolved*, That we in principle approve the plan offered by the Secretary of State as a first step in the realization of this aim; and be it further

*Resolved*, That we urge the President and the Congress and the representatives of our Nation in the Washington Conference to employ all the means at their disposal to dispel that atmosphere of suspicion which, in times past, has been so potent in producing wars; to remove all misunderstandings and causes of dispute that might lead to war; and to provide for the settlement of future international disputes by orderly process of law rather than by the irrational and destructive methods of war.

Further resolutions presented and adopted tendered appreciative thanks to the program committee and the local committee on arrangements for their careful work so greatly contributory to the success of the meeting and also expressed to the management of the Multnomah Hotel thanks for courtesies extended.

The auditing committee, Henry S. Lucas, chairman, and James Bevans, reported that they had examined the receipted bills presented by the secretary-treasurer, covering to date the year's expenses of the Pacific Coast Branch, and that the accompanying statement was found correct. The report was adopted. The amount of expenditure according to the statement was \$37.94.

The committee on nominations, Percy A. Martin, chairman, Samuel F. Bemis, and Richard F. Scholz, reported the following as officers for the ensuing year: President, Payson J. Treat, Stanford University; vice president, Eugene I. McCormac, University of California; secretary-treasurer, William A. Morris, University of California. Members of the council, in addition to the above: Robert G. Cleland, Occidental College; Miss Crystal Harford, University High School, Oakland, Calif.; Henry S. Lucas, University of Washington; Dr. Olive Kuntz, Reed College. On motion, the secretary was instructed to cast the ballot for these nominees, who were declared elected.

Prof. Percy A. Martin extended an invitation to the branch to meet next year as guests of the history department of Stanford University. On motion it was voted to accept. The business session then adjourned.

At the annual dinner, which was a joint meeting with the Oregon Historical Society, Pres. Richard F. Scholz of Reed College presided. On behalf of the Historical Society, Mr. Lewis A. McArthur presented an address on "The Lakes of Oregon." Of these it was stated there are about five hundred, varying in size from large bodies of water down to desert ponds, and appearing in four well-defined regions; (1) along the main axis of the Cascade Range; (2) Central Oregon, particularly Lake County; (3) the area in the south between the coast and the Coast Range; (4) the Wallowa Mountains. Two of these lakes stand out in importance, Bull Run Lake, of great civic and economic importance, and Crater Lake.

Pres. Robert C. Clark then presented the annual address on behalf of the Pacific Coast Branch. His topic was "The Hudson Bay Co. and early Oregon history." The claims of the Hudson Bay Co. to the Oregon country were established by three documents of the year 1821, and for the next 25 years the history of this region was largely their history. A journal of the Nisqually Post on Puget Sound has recently been found, but only two persons have brought out material from the Hudson Bay house where tons of it are stored. Miss Laut was, however, interested only in the first 10 years of this history. Miss Judson gained possession of two interesting letters of John McLaughlin. Doctor Schafer found many foreign office transcripts of the Hudson Bay Co.'s letters. There is some material at the University of British Columbia, and there is now available a continuous series of letters. But the history of the company in Oregon is far from being written.

There is some data on their policy toward their trade rivals. McLaughlin had been advised to undersell these and to close them out. In 1845 he could claim that he had defeated them. As early as 1824 he could claim no boundary south of the Columbia. One ground of justification for his aid to settlers was that a supply of grain was needed for the Russian trade in Kamchatka. McLaughlin's policy was compounded of business interest and philanthropy. The new material shows that the net profits of the Oregon trade, after deducting expenses, were, for 1842, \$30,000, and for 1843, \$60,000.

These materials also add to our knowledge of the Oregon provisional government. The McLaughlin documents show that certain parts of the story must be written. It is now known that the date

of the well-known address of the Canadian citizens was not March, 1843, as formerly held, but March, 1844.

A number of informal addresses followed, among the speakers being Frederick V. Holman, president of the Oregon Historical Society, Prof. O. H. Richardson, of the University of Washington, Prof. P. A. Martin, of Stanford University, and Prof. Samuel F. Bemis, of Whitman College. Mr. Rank, of Vancouver, Wash., displayed and explained a flag of the Hudson Bay Co., and Mr. J. D. Lee requested aid in the preparation of a history of Oregon, a task in which he is now engaged.

Saturday morning was given over to the teachers' session. The opening address, by Mr. E. E. Schwarztrauber, of the Lincoln High School, Portland, was devoted to the new course of study in history proposed by the committee on history and education for citizenship. The address, while reviewing the reports of various other committees, emphasized especially the recommendations of the committee of which Doctor Schafer is chairman.

The address which followed was given by Dr. H. D. Sheldon, dean of the School of Education of the University of Oregon and a member of the advisory board of the National Council for Social Studies. He set out the plans of the board as embracing a bulletin of progress and evenness of training in social science subjects. Progressive school men and schools of education object to the great proportion of time hitherto given to ancient and medieval history. There is a feeling that ancient history as taught is largely useless; that the beginning should be made with social evolution rather than the building of the pyramids; that other social science subjects should receive recognition; that civics should be an integral part of the course; that the attempt to make an intellectual discipline of history should be abandoned; that to avoid the ill effects of poorly prepared teachers' work we must come to a project method, breaking history up into problems.

The speaker described the committee of eight report as an attempt at compromise between newer and older points of view. Mr. Rugg, of the national board, has criticized it as not founded on scientific study, but merely on the personal views of the members. He proposes the selection of a group of a hundred and twenty economists, political scientists, anthropologists, and others to make a list of the great problems of the day as they see them; and an examination of current-events periodicals to ascertain what personages and problems are now functioning. To this Doctor Schafer's rejoinder is that all this plan, too, will bring out is opinions. The speaker suggests that the result will probably not be so very different

from present views as is supposed. In conclusion, it was stated that the outstanding problems are three: A cycle of work that can be fitted in (to be very generally demanded); the training of teachers; a norm of auxiliary material.

Mr. H. H. Savage, of the Salem High School, led the discussion. He held that only a small part of history is of use to the ordinary citizen and commended the report of Doctor Schafer's committee as placing emphasis on economic, social, political, and religious forces, as stating problems in terms of the pupils' experience, and as attempting to make history function in the present.

Some general discussion followed, in the course of which Miss May Darling, of the Washington High School, Portland, took issue with statements made by other speakers. She held that children are not primarily interested in the things about them, but in the past. She said that she finds them bored with what little history they have had in the grade schools, and that when they come to high school they think they know history. She held that the aim is to know the past, to be able to get at truth; and condemned the project method, because it means picking up scraps of information.

The concluding address of the morning was by L. Griffin, of the University of Oregon, who described the two-year course in world history now being installed in that university.

---

---

III. PROCEEDINGS OF THE SEVENTEENTH ANNUAL  
CONFERENCE OF HISTORICAL SOCIETIES

---

ST. LOUIS, DECEMBER 29, 1921

---

---



## PROCEEDINGS OF THE SEVENTEENTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF HISTORICAL SOCIETIES

The seventeenth annual session of the conference of historical societies was held at the Jefferson Memorial in St. Louis, Mo., on December 29, 1921, as a part of the program of the annual meeting of the American Historical Association. Mr. George S. Godard, State librarian of Connecticut, presided over the session and two papers were read and discussed. Mr. Newton D. Mereness, of Washington, D. C., presented a paper on "Material in Washington of value to the States"; and Mr. Theodore C. Pease, of the Illinois State Historical Library, followed with a paper on "Historical materials in the depositories of the Middle West." These papers, together with an account of the discussion which followed, are printed in the later pages of these proceedings.

The program was followed by a business session presided over by the chairman of the conference, Mr. Godard. Before proceeding to the items of business the chairman asked each one present, in the interests of a better acquaintance, to rise and give his name and the historical society or other institution with which he was connected. Mr. John C. Parish, secretary of the conference, then reported informally upon the activities of the conference during the year. He stated that the proceedings of the meeting for 1920 had been published separately by the conference and had been sent out to the member societies at the time of mailing notices of the meeting for 1921. This plan of separate publication will enable the societies to receive the proceedings at an earlier date than if they were reprinted from the annual reports of the American Historical Association, and it is hoped that the annual dues of the societies will make it possible to carry out this policy regularly.

The amount received in dues for the year 1921 was much larger than in any previous year. A statement of receipts and expenditures is printed on a later page of these proceedings. The secretary stated, however, that although the receipts had been gratifying, they had come from a comparatively few societies in the conference. It was therefore an inequitable burden upon those few. They paid in several cases as much as \$10 each, their membership numbering 1,000 or more and the basis of assessment being 1 cent per member. The secretary, therefore, made the proposal that the basis of support be changed; that the policy of assessing each society

upon the basis of 1 cent per member be discontinued, and that the constitution of the conference be modified so as to provide that each society should pay a flat rate of \$1. This, it was suggested, would mean a lightening of the burden for most societies, but the secretary hoped that it would bring a wider support and perhaps result in as large receipts. After some discussion the conference voted to adopt the proposal and so amend the constitution.

Mr. Buck, of the Minnesota Historical Society, suggested that it was a matter of justice that only those societies who paid the dues should be considered as members and receive the publications, and the conference voted that the secretary be instructed to send out notices and circular letters to the entire mailing list, but to enroll as members and send publications only to those societies which remitted the annual fee.

The chairman of the committee on the Handbook of Historical Societies, Mr. George N. Fuller, of the Michigan Historical Commission, was unable to be present, but sent word that the committee had met and, after discussion of plans, had arranged to secure one person in each State to make a canvass of the historical organizations in his State; that such an individual had been enlisted in practically every one of the States and that the data collected from 90 societies in 1920 would be turned over to these individuals as a basis for their work.

The committee on the continuation of the Griffin Bibliography of Historical Societies, Mr. Joseph Schafer, chairman, reported that steps had been taken in the direction of such a continuation, but no definite results could yet be reported.

The discussion of the paper of Mr. Mereness in the preceding program having raised the question of a national archives building, a motion was made and carried to appoint a committee to draw up resolutions expressing the sentiment of the conference of historical societies in favor of the immediate erection of such a building and strongly urging the action of Congress in this direction, and providing that copies should be sent to Senators Smoot, Underwood, and Poindexter. The chairman appointed upon this committee Mr. Victor H. Paltsits, of the New York Public Library, Mr. Solon J. Buck, of the Minnesota Historical Society, and Mr. Morgan P. Robinson, of the Virginia State Archives. The committee prepared the following resolutions, which were sent by the secretary to the Senators designated:

*Whereas*, in the interest of administrative efficiency and in aid of historical research, it is generally recognized that the national archives in the city of Washington, now scattered and largely unorganized, should be concentrated in an adequate national archives building, and

*Whereas*, excellent tentative plans have heretofore been drawn in the office of the Federal Architect, which propound the correct ideas with respect to the proper housing of our national monuments.

Be it *Resolved*, that we urge upon our Government to provide without further delay a site and begin to construct thereon an adequate building in which to concentrate, coordinate, and safeguard the precious heritages of the past and provide thereby a means to prevent further loss, neglect, deterioration, destruction, or other ravages in our official records and files.

Be it further *Resolved*, that until such a building is ready and the records have been placed therein, we urge that particular attention be given and regulations provided by the Government to prevent further ravages among the public records, and more care in regard to the elimination and destruction of any papers, files, or other public records.

And, *Resolved*, that copies of these resolutions be sent to Senator Smoot, Senator Underwood, and Senator Poindexter, with the prayer that they aid in the speedy consummation of this great patriotic service to our beloved country.

The meeting then proceeded to the election of a chairman for the ensuing year. A nominating committee was appointed which proposed the name of Mr. Victor H. Paltsits, of the New York Public Library. Mr. Paltsits was unanimously elected as chairman of the conference for the year 1922. The executive council of the American Historical Association, which names the secretary of the conference, had reelected Mr. John C. Parish as secretary for the same term.

The following is a partial list of the delegates and other persons present at the meeting: Theodore C. Blegen, Hamline University; Beverly W. Bond, jr., Ohio Historical and Philosophical Society; Verne H. Bowles, Missouri Historical Society; William Clark Breckenridge, State Historical Society of Missouri; Solon J. Buck, Minnesota Historical Society; Harrison C. Dale, University of Oklahoma; John H. Edwards, archives division, commonwealth of Massachusetts; L. Fuerdriogue, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Mo.; Dixon Ryan Fox, New York State Historical Association; George S. Godard, Connecticut State Library; E. R. Harlan, Historical department of Iowa; Archer B. Hulbert, Colorado College; Herbert A. Kellar, McCormick Historical Society; Bruce E. Mahan, State Historical Society of Iowa; Mrs. Eugene Marsh, St. Louis, Mo.; Newton D. Mereness, Washington, D. C.; John W. Oliver, Indiana Historical Commission; Edward C. Page, Northern Illinois State Teachers College; Victor H. Paltsits, New York Public Library; John C. Parish, State Historical Society of Iowa; Theodore C. Pease, Illinois State Historical Library; Milo M. Quaife, State Historical Society of Wisconsin; Morgan P. Robinson, State archives of Virginia; Joseph Schafer, State Historical Society of Wisconsin; Frank H. Severance, Buffalo Historical Society; C. C. Stiles, public archives division, historical department of Iowa; James Sullivan

New York State Historical Association; F. M. Surrey, New York City; N. M. Miller Surrey, American Historical Association; R. C. Ballard Thruston, Filson Club, Louisville, Ky.

---

PAPERS AND DISCUSSION

MATERIAL IN WASHINGTON OF VALUE TO THE STATES

(Abstract of paper)

By NEWTON D. MEBENESS

Much of the source material for the early history of each of the thirteen original States is contained in the British Record Office. A substantial portion of that for most of the other States is contained in our national archives in Washington. There is in this Washington material a primeval flavor and a vigorous spirit, for it is a record of frontier life, of the formative period of various institutions, and, particularly, of the establishment, operation and development of State and Federal relations.

The commanders of exploring expeditions, the builders and commanders of military posts for the defense of the frontier, the commanders of departments, and the commanders of expeditions against hostile Indians received their instructions from, were in frequent correspondence with, and reported to the Secretary of War or The Adjutant General. This correspondence is in the archives division of The Adjutant General's office. In the Inspector General's office are reports of inspection of frontier military posts; and among the records of the Weather Bureau are weather observations, with curious notes on topography and the coming and departing of birds and flowers, that were kept from 1819 to 1860.

In the Indian Office is the correspondence of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Interior with the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, of the commissioner with the several superintendents of Indian Affairs, and of each superintendent with the Indian agents within his superintendency. Here, also, is a large number of letters by Army officers and private individuals. This correspondence, together with the records of proceedings of special commissions, constitutes a wealth of material with regard to fur trade and liquor traffic, Indian hostilities, measures for the maintenance of peace, claims on account of Indian depredations, the demoralization of Indians by white men, efforts to civilize or Christianize the Indians, negotiations for the purchase of Indian titles to lands, Indian reservations, the payment of Indian annuities, graft, and the removal of Indians to lands on the more remote frontier.

Records of the operations of Territorial governments are in the Department of State which was charged with their direction and control. These records embrace correspondence of the Secretary of State with Territorial governors and Territorial secretaries, and journals of legislative and executive proceedings. They tell of matters pertaining to Indians and lands, of laws enacted, of boundary disputes, of litigation, of the appointment and removal of officers, and occasionally of friction between officers or between branches of the Government. In this department, too, is some diplomatic and consular correspondence of particular interest to States having an international boundary.

From the date of the establishment of a Territory until several years after that Territory became a State the operations of most general interest were those pertaining to the survey and disposal of lands; and for historical purposes the most valuable record of those operations, not now available within the State, is the correspondence of the Commissioner of the General Land Office with the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of the Interior, Members of Congress, Surveyors General, Registers and Receivers. This correspondence is housed in part in the General Land Office and in part in the file room of the office of the Secretary of the Interior.

Source material for a history of communication is to be found both in the Post Office Department and in the files of the House and Senate Committees on Post Offices and Post Roads. With a limited amount of labor all post offices of a State that have at any time been in operation may be listed not only alphabetically but also in the chronological order in which they were established and with full data regarding each.

The letters by the Postmasters General are informing on every phase of the development of the system of communication from 1789 to 1832, but for the years subsequent to 1832 only a small portion of the story is contained in them, and all but a few of the letters to the Postmaster General have been destroyed. Fortunately, the department still has the route books, and for the years 1854 to 1872 it has the letters received by the contract office which was charged with the supervision of the operation of all routes. In the House and Senate files are many petitions for an extension, increase and improvement of the service, and a record of the responses of Congress to their prayers.

The House and Senate files contain material on every subject mentioned in this paper. They contain also much that is necessary to a thoroughgoing history of transportation, as does the Treasury Department for a history of finance and the Department of Justice for a history of the administration of justice. The Department of Commerce has a mass of unpublished data collected by the Bureau of the Census. Many early newspapers published within the States are now available only in the Library of Congress, and here the files are often incomplete. The manuscript division of the Library of Congress has a large number of collections of private papers. For Ohio, in particular, there are the Duncan McArthur, William Allen, and Salmon P. Chase papers, and for Kentucky the Breckenridge papers. In the War Department are muster rolls for the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, the war with Mexico, the Civil War, and the Spanish-American War.

Usually the older the papers the greater their value. A larger portion of those of recent date are a record of administrative routine, and a larger portion of the recent ones have been published. For obvious reasons, however, these observations do not apply to the records of the late war, and no State war historian should fail to examine at least the operation records of the division, regiments, or other units in which the men from his State were largely represented; the records of camps within the borders of his State or at which the men from his State were stationed; the records of hospitals with which the men of his State had most to do; the reports of the Federal food administrator for his State; letters or petitions by citizens of his State to members of his State's delegation in Congress; the testimony of citizens of his State before House and Senate committees; and records in the files of the War Industries Board pertaining to the principal industries of his State.

HISTORICAL MATERIALS IN THE DEPOSITORIES OF  
THE MIDDLE WEST

(Abstract of paper)

By THEODORE C. PEASE, Illinois State Historical Library

Of course, one can not classify in strict chronological order the various principles under which we have cherished various types of historical material. There is a certain fairly well defined period at which each principle seems to suggest itself first; but once established each principle persists, and rightly so, even though newer ones arise to rob it of the charm of novelty.

Among western collections one naturally begins with the Draper collection at Madison. I think we should all define alike the principle on which Lyman C. Draper laid the foundations of his collection—the glorification and preservation to posterity of the hero of the Revolution, of the frontier, of the wars of the Republic. There is but one Draper collection, but most depositories can boast acquisitions made on similar principles; diaries and letters of soldiers of the Mexican and Civil Wars; even the similar materials that our typists are copying in war-records divisions to-day. Of course, our war-records sections have, perforce, collected with an eye not only to the soldier in the field but also to the State organized for war; but this represents only a complication of the primary type.

The Gov. Ninian Edwards papers and the Elias Kent Kane papers in the Chicago Historical Society, the papers of Governor Lucas, of Iowa, and other collections too numerous to detail, stand for a recognition of the fact that the politics of the past generation have become history and its correspondence and diaries are of value to the historian. The historical student of to-day, aware though he is of the existence of other fields which his predecessor ignored, is well content to continue to enter on this one also, blessing the past generation for what it preserved and cursing it for the numerous similar collections that have gone to the fire or the waste-paper merchant.

The economic and social interpretations of history have led in their turn to the acquisition of materials of yet another type. The age when the fur trade had receded far enough into the past to assume the glamour of romance and the air of antiquity that history demands saw the collection and preservation of the letters and account books that emphasized what was picturesque and adventurous in the life of the trader and trapper. The student of economic history has seized on these materials with a truer appreciation of the economic importance of the institution and the system of finance behind it. For examples, one turns to the Chouteau and other papers in the Jefferson Memorial, of this city, and to the Grignon and Porlier papers, at Madison; the Sulley, Talliaferro, and Brown collections, at St. Paul. Again, the Wisconsin Historical Society in its acquisition of the papers of pioneer lumbermen, railroad magnates, etc., such as the Moses A. Strong and Cyrus Woodman papers, has taught us the importance that such materials possess in the writing of the economic history of our Commonwealth. Now, we recognize the books of the pioneer storekeeper, the papers of any man connected with business or finance, as materials without which we can not really write the economic history of the West.

Further, we have recognized that the pioneer missionary and preacher have their importance as representing the spiritual forces in the development of the new communities. The pioneer minister in frock coat or shirt sleeves or hunting shirt, we now see, is no less a vital figure in the life of his day than the black-robed Jesuit who preceded him. Religious history, once left

severely to the churches, now has its recognized place in the development of the western Commonwealths. Minnesota especially has been fortunate in securing such material.

In recent years, also, we have seen the importance of preserving the records of State and local governments. A few Commonwealths, such as Iowa, Michigan, and Minnesota, have made great advances in the scientific care of State and local records. With others, the bringing of archive science into our State and local record rooms is still an inspiration for the future rather than an accomplished fact in the present.

Especially concerned with collecting material to illustrate the rise of their own Commonwealths or the political battles in which their citizens contended for the great offices of the Nation, the collectors of the past generations ignored the subtle interplay of spiritual and ideal influences between the older East and the newer West and the results on both. Of course, there were notable exceptions. Draper could never have cherished the idea of fencing his pioneers within State boundaries. To confine similarly the frontier explorer and missionary would be as difficult as the Government of Canada found the task of keeping the *coureur de bois* out of the wilderness. The authors of the State histories in the eighties found that they had to let these illustrious pioneers go and come as they would; but their writings seem to look forward to periods in which the gates of State limits could be barred against any interloper. This limitation to State boundaries in our collections of material is only too easy and natural. Expenditures must be justified to legislatures; funds are meager; and the field, even of the State proper, is very large.

A broader conception of western history has come as we have followed fully the half-expressed ideals of men like Justin Winsor, so that we recognize the West in the formative period as one of the stakes on the hazard table of world politics, a stake for which France, England, and the United States contended until at the close of the War of 1812 the United States swept her winnings from the board. This view has grown upon us until our historians have learned to look with suspicion upon the march of a few scores of Frenchmen or Spaniards across revolutionary Illinois as possible results of the imperial projects of powers 4,000 miles away. As we have recognized the importance of these larger relations, we have sought far and wide for the materials to illustrate them. We have sought at Ottawa and at Washington among transcripts from European archives. We have searched the papers of British statesmen, the Public Record Office, and the Archives Nationales for the motives of British-French diplomacy and imperial organization. We have sought in the multitude of archives of Mexico and Cuba and old Spain, the tortuous trace of Spanish diplomacy. We have utilized as accessories to our end the copy, the photographic plate, the photostat. I need only mention as illustrations, the collections of copies from the Archives Nationales, which the Illinois Historical Survey shares with the Library of Congress, and the Cunningham transcripts.

A calendar of the contents of the archives at Washington so far as they relate to the Western States is being prepared by Doctor Mereness for the State of Indiana, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan, Iowa, and Illinois; and in the enterprise it is to be hoped that other States in the valley may soon cooperate, with the end of securing for us all the material for a fuller understanding of the influence of the Federal Government in the formative period of the West.

If in the light of the undertakings we have actually on hand we undertake to formulate the concept of western history that to-day guides our search

for materials we shall find it so broad as to be startling. Our materials must explain the contest of Indian, Latin, and Anglo-Saxon for the possession of the great valley. They must show us the first roots of future civilization in the valley, whether French, Spanish, English, or American. They must trace to its origins the American civilization that developed here in the nineteenth century, in its economic exploitation of western resources, in its struggles for political self-determination against the older States, and for a real voice in the affairs of the Nation, in its yearning toward higher ideals in politics, in the social order, in the things of the spirit. They must show us the product of the reaction of these ideals in the older States and the new reaction that this product itself caused in the West; how, for example, western democracy first flowered in the West as emotion rather than theory; how its pollen was carried to the East to cross-fertilize political thought and produce the theoretical democracy of George Bancroft, and how that hybrid refertilized the original western stock.

If we are to attain to this ideal, we must seek for a much closer unity and closer cooperation between the official collectors of historical material in the Mississippi Valley. While each State should doubtless specialize in such materials as relate to its local development or its local concerns, there should be a wide interchange, between States, of copies of such of their materials as have a broader interest. We need not be afraid of duplication of material. The more widely the calendars at Washington relating to the transcripts of European material are disseminated, the broader and truer our concepts of western history must be. Calendars and *résumés* of collections should be exchanged between western libraries until we are thoroughly aware of each other's resources. The suggestion has already come to me for a joint list of materials in western collections to replace the very tentative one published at Madison 15 years ago. The conference might well consider some such scheme. Further, when all this is done, we must set up the ideal in each repository; the collection of materials on so wide a scale that they shall offer to any serious student of local history an historical vista in which he may see clearly the relation of his local community to the larger forces which have created it, and to the forces of re-creation it has itself set in motion.

---

The discussion of the papers turned largely upon the materials at Washington. Mr. Victor H. Paltsits asked for further information of Mr. Mereness in regard to the lost records in the departments at Washington. He remarked that he himself had rescued Federal records which had been picked up in auction rooms in New York City and Philadelphia. He asked in particular about the census records.

Mr. Mereness, in answering, told many interesting facts about gaps in public records, about their loss in some cases and the great risks that were being run, calling attention, however, to the difficulties confronting the officials because of lack of space. Mr. Quaife, of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, told of experiences in dealing with the archives of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and Mr. R. C. Ballard Thruston, of the Filson Club, Louisville, Ky., discussed the archives at Washington and the muster rolls of Indian wars.

Mr. Thruston related, also, the experience of Kentucky with reference to her archives. When the new capitol of Kentucky was built, the archives were taken over to the new building, but it was found that there was not enough room for them and they were returned to the old capitol, where they were literally scooped into the basement. One roomful was sorted out, but four rooms were piled high with unsorted documents. Later, room was made in the basement of the new capitol and they were arranged in four rows about 100 feet long. There were still some, however, remaining in the old capitol. Some documents also had been turned over to the State Historical Society of Kentucky.

There was a general discussion of the dangers surrounding the valuable archives material, particularly with reference to fires, and a strong feeling developed in the meeting which resulted in the passage of a memorial, as described in the proceedings of the business meeting, urging upon Congress the necessity of constructing a national archives building.



---

---

IV. CONFERENCE OF ARCHIVISTS

---

CONFERENCE ON THE TEACHING OF HISTORY  
IN SCHOOLS

---

ST. LOUIS, DECEMBER 28, 1921



## CONFERENCE OF ARCHIVISTS

The conference discussed "How can the States be persuaded to take care of their historical archives?" and "The future of the Public Archives Commission."

The only abstract received of remarks made at the conference was that on "Lessons from Iowa," by C. C. Stiles, Iowa State Department of History. His paper will appear in the Nineteenth Report of the Public Archives Commission: 1918-1922, in the Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the year 1922.

---

## CONFERENCE ON THE TEACHING OF HISTORY IN SCHOOLS

### DESIRABLE ADJUSTMENTS BETWEEN HISTORY AND THE OTHER SOCIAL SCIENCES

By ROLLA M. TRYON, University of Chicago

In discussing the subject in relation to the elementary and high schools, it is convenient to consider it as of four divisions: (1) Independent and parallel adjustment of history and the social sciences; (2) independent and alternate adjustment; (3) unified adjustment; (4) a combination of unified and independent parallel adjustment, with unification in the first three or more grades and independent parallel adjustment for the remainder.

Philadelphia is the best representative of the first division. There are many cities already following her lead. Citizenship by long training is the aim of this school.

With No. 2, adjustment is more popular in the Middle West, where usually one-half the year is given to each. Richmond, Ind., is perhaps as good as any example of the use of this method. With Nos. 3 and 4, unified adjustment of history with the social sciences has as yet made small progress.

By E. M. VIOLETTE, *State Teachers' College, Kirksville, Mo.*

Assuming from present indications that the social sciences will be given a central place in the curricula of the schools and be required in all the grades from the first to the twelfth, inclusive, it is suggested that the readjustment between the social sciences in the col-

lege should begin by either abolishing the present introductory courses and organizing a single one that will combine the essentials of these courses, or making the present freshman course in European history a prerequisite for all other courses in the social sciences. Upon this common introductory course there should be arranged a series of sequences with certain interdepartmental requirements according to the subjects chosen as majors.

*Discussion.*—BESSIE L. PIERCE, of the State University of Iowa: Although the process of directing the young idea is often controlled by fads and fancies, one must admit that the "new education" has much vitality and utility. The insistence upon a practical course in history, which will develop a functioning citizenship, has produced a new type of teaching which is not without merit. It has brought into the elementary and secondary schools subject matter new to the history course, causing an elimination of much that was formerly taught, and producing chaotic conditions probably unparalleled in history teaching. No one of us has been quite able to cope with the situation, although we have preempted the place for social studies in the curriculum and can retain it if we take note of the signs of the times.

The layman has at last accepted history as an essential part of the education of the youth of the country, but he has attempted to pick flaws in the course of study as laid down, and to substitute much that he feels should be accepted. The recent State laws are the outgrowth of the after-war glow of patriotic fervor and sometimes lead to courses of study nonfunctioning and without the qualities desired by the legislators. It is plainly "up to" the historian to direct the tendencies of the times.

It is to be doubted whether the school administrator will sacrifice to a great extent other subjects in order to give a place both to history and the social studies. In fact, although the parallel arrangement may be desirable from the standpoint of content, yet it is scarcely feasible or necessary in the eyes of the school superintendent. If history is the story of mankind, he believes it need not include merely past politics. All of the activities of man must be included. How he gains his food, his shelter, his clothing; his relationship to his fellow men; and the obligation due a protecting government. These are as much a part of the history course as the recital of dynastic changes. A study of the family as the basis of society and of the States with their organized group life should be parts of the history course. The sociologist is now claiming a definite place in the curriculum, and in many instances he is getting it. The economist likewise is insisting upon more time for his subject. In many cases there is little correlation between these subjects and the history courses whose places they have taken. Yet the average high-school pupil will be far less interested and satisfied with a course purely sociological or economic than with one in which there is a combination of these with specific historical data. It is the historian who has the opportunity of shaping a course of study in which there shall be not less but more history than in the past; history that will answer the requirements laid down by those demanding more social studies.

A year of social-science work is now accorded, either as an elective or as a required study. The four units of social-science work likely to be required of all high-school students represent a departure from the traditional history course of the National Educational Association committee which has found general acceptance among public-school administrators. However, those who have followed this course are now looking for a more effective course in the first

year. As generally taught, community civics is given a full year, whereas it has subject matter for only about a half year. Had this course been designed to give an historic background to the problems presented, it would have proved far more fruitful.

Alternate arrangements where there is the new type of course are eliminating much historical data which should be presented. The ideal arrangement would make it possible for the social studies to be presented by people so well trained in all of the subjects that there would be constant correlation. But in the present state of disorganization history has the greater advantage. We are not equipped to produce the unified plan. With the advantage of priority of position and of organization the historian should be able to devise some means to preserve his subject in a way which will meet the demands of modern education and yet will not destroy the intrinsic value of history. Surely this can be done by a combination of two of the possible adjustments suggested; that is, a combination of the alternate type of a course of study with the unified plan. Let us devise a course of study which will give a place to facts in sociology, to others in political science, and to others in economics; presented with an historical background and through historical instances.

The great mass of children who attend the public schools send few representatives to higher institutions of learning; hence it is far more essential that the courses in the elementary and secondary schools should be definitely outlined than should be the course in college.

LOUISE IRBY, of the North Carolina College for Women.—There is the greatest need for the formulation of the aims of the social studies. In regard to history, often those trying to formulate a program have had different sets of aims. When one is considering the aims of education in general and of the social studies in particular, one can not ignore the claim that all education is for citizenship. In April, 1919, there was formed a committee on teaching citizenship which was frankly a propaganda committee to give publicity to the report of the committee on social studies of the National Educational Association. From February through June of 1920 there appeared in the *Historical Outlook* a department of social studies containing articles by members of the committee. A part of the same movement of education for citizenship was the formation of the committee on history and education for citizenship to consider the entire series of problems connected with the teaching of history in the primary and secondary schools. After presenting a program for the 12 grades, the committee decided to confine its recommendations to courses for the four years of high school. Syllabi have appeared for the ninth, tenth, and eleventh grades. In connection with one of the syllabi the statement was made that the committee was willing to see their own subject sacrificed if by doing so the demands of citizenship training would be more satisfactorily realized.

The idea of education for citizenship has paved the way for a larger proportion of time to be given to the social studies in the elementary and high schools. Yet there is a danger. In regard to history I do not agree with those who say that they are willing to sacrifice history as a subject if it is necessary for better citizenship. The note struck in the following statement is a hopeful sign: "Emotional interest in Americanization and training for citizenship has about run its course. Thoughtful people have concluded that there is little difference between education and training for citizenship."

An organization formed last March which may be of help in solving these problems is the National Council for Social Studies. The purpose is "to bring about the association and cooperation of teachers of social studies, history, government, economics, sociology, etc., and of administrators, supervisors, teach-

ers of education, and others interested in obtaining the maximum results in education for citizenship through social studies."

Professor FLING, of the University of Nebraska, asserted that the difference between the social sciences and history is in the point of view and not in the subject matter. He urged that the historical point of view be retained along with the natural-science point of view of economics and the other social sciences.

Professor TRENHOLME, of the University of Missouri, protested against sacrificing history for the teaching of citizenship. He approved of citizenship courses for college freshmen in combination with English composition but not as a substitute for history.

Professor PAXSON, of the University of Wisconsin, was not worried for fear that history would be forced from high schools. He was sure the social sciences would be admitted but would not crowd out history.

Professor CROTHERS, of Dartmouth College, outlined the course in citizenship given to Dartmouth freshmen. The textbooks used were the New York Times and the New Republic, which he asserted gave a very good poise to thinking.

Professor TRYON moved that the section request the council to ask the college-entrance examination board to formulate a set of history questions up to 1648. Adopted.

---

---

## V. PROBLEMS OF ECONOMIC HISTORY

---

---



# THE DEVELOPMENT OF METROPOLITAN ECONOMY IN EUROPE AND AMERICA<sup>1</sup>

(Abstract of paper)

BY N. S. B. GRAS, University of Minnesota

There are three questions raised by this paper: First, whether national economy has any real validity as a unit or organization in production; second, whether metropolitan economy, or the dominance of the large commercial city, should be put in its place; and third, what evidence concerning metropolitan development is to be found in European and American history.

One of the various meanings of national economy is an organization for administering the economic affairs of the nation. The State administers in at least two important ways. First, it passes laws aiding business; and, second, it also administers directly by setting up a system of coinage, a judicial service, a post office, and so on. But who will maintain that, because the State performs important services for economic life, we have national economy in the sense of national production?

In time of war the nation's control of production may become complete. In a socialistic State, as in Russia to-day, State ownership may prevail. In Germany Hugo Stinnes may become more powerful than the Kaiser ever was; may conceivably own the whole nation or hold it in pawn. And yet none of these things would of necessity materially change the organization of production. The same principles of economy and efficiency would ultimately prevail.

National economy as an organization in economic administration has existed in peace and war for centuries in western Europe and for generations in eastern Europe. It prevailed while village economy was the unit of production and when town economy took its place. And if we should suddenly create a world State with powers of economic administration, we should not see much, if any, change in the public unit or organization of production.

The national economic administration has been carried on in accordance with certain policies acceptable to the day and generation. During the stages of village and town economy the State policy was

---

<sup>1</sup> Abstract made by the Editor. Original paper published in *Amer. Hist. Rev.* (July, 1922), xxvii, 695-908.

generally fiscal. In some advanced countries of Europe this gave way in the sixteenth century to mercantilism. In time mercantilism was weakened by, and in some countries gave way to, *laissez-faire*, which in a sense was a return to the old-time fiscal policy. And within the last generation or two we see a tendency to return to a policy somewhat akin to mercantilism in its directive influence and its concentration of power in the hands of the government; but while mercantilism aimed at national material strength, the new policy aims at social well-being.

I accept national economy as a unit or organization in economic control and administration. I accept it as having a secondary meaning, national policy, found frequently in America not long ago. But I can not find any excuse for regarding it as a unit in production on a par with village and town economy. By a unit of production is, of course, meant an organization of producers based on a division of labor, wherein, for example, the villagers performed special services chiefly in agriculture, and the townsmen chiefly in the retail trade. Thus it is quite different from ownership, policy, or administration, though in the village stage, it is true, the administrative and the productive units coincided, but not in the town or subsequent stages.

Over a generation ago Schmoller emphasized the element of politics and administration when beginning his articles on mercantilism and national economy; but, later, he extended the idea of national economy from a unit in administration to a unit in actual production.

Shortly afterwards, Bücher arrived at a similar conclusion. He maintained that "Each portion of the country, each section of the population, must in the service of the whole take over those duties that its natural endowments best fitted it to perform." This was supposed to begin in the sixteenth century, but I find such geographical specialization at a much earlier date. Long before the sixteenth century, Englishmen obtained their tin from one section, their coal and iron each from two sections, certain fine clothes from another, and their novelties largely from a very few towns.

More serious is the idea that the nation exists unto itself. Some parts of a state may be economically more closely connected with parts of near-by states than with other parts of the same state. A national trade is as much a fiction as a national industry or a national agriculture. Shall we substitute metropolitan economy for national economy, as the latest stage in the development of production?

By metropolitan economy is meant the concentration of the trade of a wide area in one great city. While the radius of the area dominated commercially by the medieval town had rarely been more than a score of miles, the radius of the area dominated by a metropolis is

roughly a hundred miles or more in length. The metropolis itself is the center not only for the area of the local trade but also for the trade between metropolitan units.

The structure of the metropolitan economic unit is made up, firstly, of the metropolis itself with its merchants, bankers, warehousemen, transport officials, and other specialized men of business; and secondly, of the district or hinterland with its towns and villages, its countryside of farms, forests, streams, and mines. But while the metropolis itself widens its confines with general economic development, the hinterland decreases in size.

The essential part of metropolitan economy is not size or structure but function. The metropolis concentrates the trade of a wide district. It is more economical for a few dealers in a metropolis to specialize in the intermetropolitan trade, which is usually wholesale, than for traders located in small towns in the hinterland to maintain connections and credits with distant parts. Metropolitan economy exists because of its efficiency as a unit in production. Public policy, national administration, even socialism would hardly long continue an attempt to alter so economical an organization.

It is the metropolitan unit that supplants the town unit of former times.

Although it may be true, that we should substitute metropolitan economy for national economy as a unit in production, nevertheless it would be a grave error to divorce metropolitan economy as a unit in production from national economy as a unit in administration. The relationship between village, town, and metropolitan organization on the one hand and the national organization on the other is close and reciprocal. For national economy as an organization in production we should substitute metropolitan economy, but there is as yet no substitute for national economy as an administrative organization.

The evidence for metropolitan development is found in the history of modern Europe and America, but, the earlier period deserves at least brief consideration. In ancient days there were flourishing towns with a brisk local and extended trade.

In the Middle Ages, Genoa, Florence, and Venice showed metropolitan promise, as did Bruges and Antwerp for a short time. Circumstances largely political prevented these cities from completely developing into metropolitan economy.

London is the best illustration, because it developed early and has slowly gone through all the phases of metropolitan growth. Some cities are still in village economy, some in town economy, and some have just begun to enter metropolitan economy. Although the different phases of growth hold true for the older metropolitan cen-

ters, nevertheless, in the newer countries and parts of the world, the order of development is somewhat different.

The growth of metropolitan centers has been the occasion of competition and rivalry. At times this rivalry has been between metropolitan centers in different political units. For example, London's rivalry with Amsterdam, is a part of history. But her rivalry with Paris on a much smaller scale is generally overclouded by the political struggle between England and France. Often metropolitan rivalry is between centers in the same state. Manchester-Liverpool is perhaps the only reasonably successful English rival of London, and it has not gone much beyond the third phase of development.

Nowhere can metropolitan rivalry be more profitably studied than in America. Metropolitan cities have developed in competition with one another along four main lines. Three run east and west and one north and south. The outstanding illustration of metropolitan rivalry is in the competition of Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore, for the products of western New York State, especially for the flour of the Genesee Valley. Largely by means of the Erie Canal, New York City won, but, though its victory was marked, it was not complete, nor is it to-day, for a struggle still continues.

A detailed analysis of the metropolitan organization in America obviously goes beyond the limits of this paper. While some centers show considerable promise, others seem to be declining relatively, notably Baltimore and Cincinnati. Two, Pittsburgh and Detroit, each with about a million inhabitants if we include the contiguous urban territory, are not metropolitan at all, but industrial satellites. Each is based largely on a single industry; Pittsburgh on iron and steel and Detroit on the automobile. While Pittsburgh is subordinate to New York and Philadelphia, and more and more to Cleveland, Detroit is subordinate to Chicago, although each has a measure of (temporary) independence.

Washington is another large city which is not metropolitan in an economic sense, though it has some financial importance due to its being the seat of government. In this same category are several German capitals which are essentially political centers. Indeed Germany as a whole shows the indelible impression of its former political localism. Berlin is the only well-developed German metropolis that has passed through all four phases of growth, though there are, of course, other notable commercial centers of promise and attainment. Germany's greatest metropolis would be near the mouth of the Rhine or the Scheldt, if economic considerations alone prevailed. It is not entirely firing a rocket into the air to say that Germany fought the late war partly to obtain a basis for a metropolitan unit in the west.

Though metropolitan economy may offer no panacea for human troubles, it is nevertheless an economic institution of far-reaching importance. It has not been discovered, or isolated as a phenomenon, partly because of the lack of definiteness and fixity of the unit and partly because of our political obsession. Born at about the same time as our strong modern states, it has quite naturally grown up unnoticed, but it has not been entirely missed, for nearly a century ago Thüman wrote about the central city. A few years back Dr. E. F. Gay of Harvard, emphasizing the marketing of goods in economic history, came to appreciate the function of the large commercial city. Dr. A. P. Usher has made a study of the influence of the metropolitan market on the French grain trade. In another place I have traced the growth of the metropolitan corn market of London, and here add the concept of an "economy," or general organization of economic life, centering in the great commercial city.

*Discussion.*—MILDRED E. HARTSOUGH, of the University of Minnesota: During the colonial period trade was carried on for the most part through the mother country, and the first towns in the Colonies may be said to have been subordinate centers in the metropolitan area of London. It was not until after the beginning of the nineteenth century, that some of these towns, such as Boston, New York, and Philadelphia, became independent metropolitan centers, their areas extending into the newly developing West and having at first no well-defined boundaries. It was to a considerable extent the competition between these rival metropolitan centers which accounted for the rapid development of means of communication with the West. The construction of the Erie Canal, the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, and the Pennsylvania Railroad are outstanding illustrations.

The hold which these cities thus established on the economic life of the West could not be permanently maintained, for, as the district beyond the Alleghenies became more highly developed, centers began there which gradually worked out a metropolitan organization of their own. This change is typified by such cities as Chicago and St. Louis.

Perhaps the most conspicuous feature of the economic history of America is the rapidity with which changes have occurred, so that almost before one economic center has become well established new centers have developed, encroaching upon the economic area of the older cities. As Chicago and St. Louis developed from the centers along the Atlantic, so the Twin Cities in the Northwest gradually became centers for the economic life of a part of the area which had originally looked to Chicago or St. Louis.

The development of the Twin Cities began with the establishment of a military post at Fort Snelling, near St. Anthony's Falls. The surrounding country at that time belonged to the Indians; but as it was opened to settlement a town grew up at the head of navigation on the Mississippi, its chief function being to trade with the settlers round about and with the trappers. Supplies for this town, St. Paul, came from Chicago and St. Louis.

A little later came the growth of a lumbering center at the Falls, and shortly after the middle of the nineteenth century St. Paul and St. Anthony (later Minneapolis) constituted a flourishing commercial center for the trade of the whole country to the north and west.

The decade following the Civil War was an era of railroad building, and the economic importance of the Twin Cities was increased by the multiplication of lines into the Northwest. Soon these cities could be considered a subsidiary center. Then they became an independent metropolitan center. Flour milling has long since outstripped lumber milling in Minneapolis and has made that city the most important flour-milling center in the United States. In the last quarter of a century livestock has become an important item in the trade of the area, and meat packing is now one of the leading industries.

The latest phase of development in this area has been the financial phase. Banks, trust companies, mortgage companies, insurance agencies, commercial paper and bond houses, and, more recently, a Federal reserve and a Federal land bank have been established which supply most of the needs for the investment of capital throughout the entire area.

Some activities, notably those concerned with the copper mines of Montana, and the iron mines of northern Minnesota, are carried on to a considerable degree independently of these cities, and new centers have developed in the area. Towns like Aberdeen and Sioux Falls, S. Dak., Fargo, N. Dak., and Mankato, Minn., have become distributing centers of considerable importance. Others, such as Winona, St. Cloud, and Cloquet, Minn., have developed industrially, due to nearness to raw material or because of some special economies. A few, such as Fargo, Mankato, and Sioux Falls are of no little financial importance in their own areas. And Duluth is apparently outside the metropolitan organization, though closer investigation indicates that this separation is more apparent than real.

It may be said, however, that in the Northwest (and this is no area of definite boundaries, but includes Minnesota, North Dakota, most of South Dakota and Montana, and a small section of west central Wisconsin) most lines of economic activity lead to St. Paul and Minneapolis.

---

## THE RELATION OF SOCIOLOGY TO SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC HISTORY

(Abstract of paper)

By HARRY E. BARNES, Clark University

No doctrine has been more widely accepted than the dogma that "man is by nature a social being." History is the record of human activities as they have taken place in a social setting. Group-life is probably the most important factor affecting the development of man and the evolution of human culture. Therefore, the science of society and the social process, sociology, can not safely be ignored by the historian. To attempt to write history without a knowledge of sociology is as futile as the effort to work out a history of physical science without a prior command of the principles of elementary mechanics.

Sociology no longer has anything in common with an a priori philosophy of history. Whatever its nature and method with earlier writers, such as Comte and Spencer, sociology has steadily become more severely inductive and more dependent upon the statistical method. While it has by no means reached a completed or

perfected stage of development, it has made sufficient discoveries concerning the behavior of men in group-life to be able to offer some actual and reliable assistance to the historian. Sociology is the only social science which even attempts to give a comprehensive view of the social process and of social revolution as a whole. It investigates the processes of social development and social organization and passes over fields or phases of these problems to the special social sciences for more detailed and specialized investigation and analysis. In the case of history the field of its special investigation is the genesis of cultural and social institutions and the factors affecting their growth. While sociology furnishes the historian with his knowledge of the principles and patterns of human behavior, with which alone the historian can proceed intelligently in historical synthesis, the historian can provide the sociologist with invaluable genetic and comparative data by recourse to which the sociologist can vastly improve the breadth and accuracy of his subject. In a sense the historian is the field worker for the historical sociologist. The generalizations which the sociologically trained historian may work out when adequate data has been furnished by historical investigation, mark the final stage of the development of historical writing as well as the fruitful completion of any problem of historical research. Yet there is no danger of sociology engulfing or absorbing history. There will always be an ample opportunity for productive labor in gathering the concrete material descriptive of human progress.

Especially close should be the relation between sociology and social and economic history. Sociology is in a position to view the process of social causation as a whole and to investigate the change of social systems. It traces the latter through progress in technology, the revolution of economic life, the resulting changes in society, and the development of defensive institutional mechanisms in government, law, education, religion, and the press. Progressive historians, such as Lamprecht, Breysig, Schmoller, Maitland, Green, Vinogradoff, Fustel, Rambaud, Ferrero, McMaster, Turner, Shotwell, Becker, Beard, and Farrand, have at least implicitly recognized the importance of sociology for synthetic history, but in the case of some of these writers the sociology utilized has been of a somewhat risky and improvised type. In such cases the work would have been far better if it had been based upon the most satisfactory type of sociology available at the time of writing. Perhaps the most important contribution of sociology to synthetic history is its revelation of the naïve procedure of many writers in imagining that they have achieved success in historical synthesis when they have published parallel chapters on political, economic, social, and intellectual history without indicating the interrelation of these different types of

influences. Sociology insists that the process of human development be viewed as a unity and an organic growth.

Illustrations are cited from European history of some of the chief sociological factors in history, including geographic environment, ethnic derivation, the building of social systems, the contact of peoples, stages of social evolution, historic types of society and civilization, and the chief static and dynamic factors in human history.

*Discussion.*—J. FRED RIPPY, of the University of Chicago: It seems to me that Professor Barnes has stated the achievements of the sociologists in an exaggerated fashion. He has claimed for sociology some of the contributions of the other social studies, even of the historians themselves. He has characterized as "laws" certain discoveries of the sociologists which are no more than tendencies, or at the most processes, and it has appeared to me at times that the author has strayed from his subject, and instead of pointing out the significance of sociology for certain kinds of history, he has discoursed upon the importance of the field of history for the sociologist.

In fact, Professor Barnes has claimed more for the sociologists than many of them would be willing to claim for themselves. Giddings admits that "much sociology is as yet nothing more than careful and suggestive guess-work"; Small notes that the interpretations of the social scientists have been "pitifully superficial, fragmentary, and incoherent" and laments the thinness and inconclusiveness of nearly everything which has hitherto passed as social "science"; one of the younger sociologists of the United States recently expressed his opinion to the effect that the "scientific method in sociology is an inspiration rather than a realization."<sup>1</sup> It does not seem to me that Professor Barnes has been as modest as these sociologists.

The chief merit of the paper lies in its very purpose. It is an attempt to set forth in concrete fashion the significance of sociology for social and economic history. This, it seems to me, is very much worth doing. The sociologists are prolific writers and much of their production is so highly speculative and closely reasoned that after the historian has passed through its logical mazes he is often too fatigued or bewildered to grasp that portion of the work which is significant for him. Then, too, the historian is so busy with other matters that he is inclined to give very little attention to the work of the sociologist. The significance of sociology for historical research needs therefore to be interpreted for the historian; and probably the best interpreters will be neither the conventional historians nor the conventional sociologists, but certain amphibious and ambidextrous individuals who have had sound training both in history and in sociology. It seems to me that Professor Barnes has given proof that he can qualify in this category. He has contended that sociology can be of assistance to the historian in both the assembling and the interpretation of the facts with which he is concerned; and I believe he has established this portion of his contention.

If he had stopped here the historians would have no quarrel with him. By insisting upon the importance of geographical factors, ethnic derivation, localization, class growth and class conflict, the contact and conflict of groups possessing different idea systems and all of those influences which make for social stability and social change; by distinguishing between stages

---

<sup>1</sup> See Hornell Hart, "Science and Sociology," in *The American Journal of Sociology*, xxvii (November, 1921), 364 ff.

of civilization, noting certain tendencies in social psychology and formulating a social vocabulary, the sociologists are destined to render valuable service to the historian. Unless the historian avails himself of these suggestions, unless he keeps them clearly before his mind, he may fail to include important facts in his collection and misinterpret the facts which he assembles. I believe historians will admit this at once. Such a contention is far different from attempting to maintain that the chief duty of the historian is to verify laws tentatively formulated by the sociologists or to formulate the universal processes underlying historical change. The historian believes that his main duty is to deal with the concrete and the unique. He sometimes makes generalizations which he believes are valuable, but he is not obsessed with the idea of reducing all that is interesting and worth while in human history to a list of laws or processes.

WALTER B. BODENHAFFER, of Washington University: Professor Barnes has given proof of his courage by accepting the difficult task of attempting to explain the meaning and significance of what, to some historians, is a specious enemy of orthodox historical method. The controversy between the claims of sociology and the established position of history is not a new one. It goes back at least as far as the Von Mohl-Treitschke debate in Germany in the middle of the nineteenth century. Although the renewal of the discussion here may not contribute to a better understanding between these two branches of social science, it will, at least, furnish a sequel to the New Orleans discussion of 20 years ago, which will be of interest to the student of the movement of thought in social science in America. It is in this rather indirect result that, perhaps, the chief advantage of this discussion lies.

In dealing with the central items in the paper presented I shall consider its main thesis; the nature of sociology as it is defined or described; and the suggested contributions of sociology to history.

The scheme of the paper involves a delimitation of the subject; a statement of the thesis; and an illustrative analysis of several different concrete situations or epochs in history, designed to show how the theory is to be applied.

One must be careful to note that Professor Barnes in delimiting his subject repudiates the older philosophy of history and historical sociology on the ground of their lack of inductive method. He does not claim that either history or sociology is to absorb the other but that each is necessarily both debtor and creditor to the other; and, furthermore, he does not attempt to persuade the historians that they ought to devote more attention to economic and social history.

The dominant idea in the paper is that knowledge of sociological principles is indispensable to any social science which, like history, deals with the development of man and his culture in social relationships. To this statement sociologists would generally subscribe, however much they might differ as to the nature of sociology or the statement of so-called sociological principles. Two important questions emerge from the discussion: What is the nature of sociology, and what sociological principles or laws or processes has sociology to contribute?

Not all sociologists would care to be bound by all the elements in the definition of sociology given by Professor Barnes. For instance, the revival, though faint, of the old conception of sociology as the overscience suggests a burden many sociologists would be unwilling to assume. That conception is one which, it seems to me, is now of historic interest only. Likewise some sociologists would not like to be represented as claiming to be very much concerned with the notion of attempting to work out a science of society in general, or of

civilization in general, or of social evolution in general, or of the stages of social evolution, or of the general laws of such evolution. The grandiose attempts of Comte, Spencer, Ward, and Giddings to perform such a function occupy a historic, not a contemporary, phase in sociology. The utter poverty of results in such a work, as Giddings's *Principles of Sociology*, seems to me to indicate nothing more than the defect in view and method of a now antiquated sociology.

With reference to the relation between sociology and history, it seems a fair question whether such relationship is as close as once assumed. Sociology's connection is much closer with several other departments of study, such as psychology, philosophy, ethics, etc. Sociology from this standpoint will view with pleasure the concession to the historian of all the problems of the past. Let him assume all the burden of all the general genetic aspects of contemporary civilization. Let him attempt the well-nigh insoluble problem of social relationships in the past. The sociologist must, more and more, center his attention on observation of behavior in a social situation which is now observable. Our case must rest on the degree of success to which we can carry our study of social processes—not a social process in any large all-inclusive sense of the term but in the very humble sense of situations in which the behavior of one form is both a stimulus of and response to another form. Whether we shall succeed or not, the chances for success are much greater where actual living social situations are observed than where a social situation of 2,000 years ago is observed. If the sociologist is puzzled by the behavior of a given individual or group under his own observation, if he can not arrive at generalizations there, he would be at a still greater loss to arrive at satisfactory generalizations concerning an individual or group in ancient Egypt.

Sociology's contribution to history, then, is to be built up out of this attempt to reduce contemporary social situations to analysis and observation and resultant laws. To this extent it will be of service to the historian, for in so far as he is more than a mere recorder of facts he has to deal with social situations out of which he can get, or into which he can put, little more than his contemporary experience.

The historian may well ask, "Where are the indispensable principles and laws developed by the sociologist with which we are to be equipped?" The paper attempts to meet this by actual examples. It lists several factors or so-called social processes which are said to be fundamental contributions of sociology to history. The chief of these are: The problem of geographic environment; ethnic derivation; contacts with other peoples; the static and dynamic factors; and the stages and types of civilization.

It is for the historians to state whether these factors are new to them or whether, if they use them, they have been derived independently of sociology. From the standpoint of sociology the question may be raised again whether the exhibit is one that all sociologists would accept. I have already hinted that, except as they indicate the necessity of a social point of view, the array is not final from a sociological standpoint.

In conclusion, it seems to me that the fundamental thesis of the paper is sound. On the other hand, the sociological exhibit does not fulfill the promise. For this defect Professor Barnes is not responsible. The fault lies in the meager results achieved by the type of sociology he is interpreting; it has not, as yet, made any very perceptible contributions, and, in my judgment, it never will. But that type of sociology does not state the whole case for sociology.

JAMES E. GILLESPIE, University of Illinois: A knowledge of social laws and social psychology, together with experience in handling sociological material

is valuable to the historian in enabling him to convey correct impressions and in giving to historical facts a natural setting.

There is real need for studying the history of the contacts of nations from a broad sociological standpoint. Emphasis has been laid hitherto upon the development of institutions within national boundaries. Present-day history should produce a set of systematic studies dealing from every possible angle with the influence of outside contacts as a force in the development of civilization.

Sociology aids us in the study of the formation of various types of society, and in a true understanding of their importance in the evolution of history. The oversea influence upon British character may be cited in illustration. The formation of aggressive types in newly settled regions has powerfully reacted upon old traditional civilizations. Illustrations are furnished by the influence of Italian settlers in the New World upon their motherland; by the British Empire as a renewal plant; by the contributions of the American civilization to the older European one.

In commenting upon Professor Barnes's statements concerning the emergence of modern times emphasis should be placed upon the rôle of European expansion as a modernizing influence. By creating world commerce, vast industries, and large sums of capital the old guild system and the static agricultural society of the feudal age were broken. The aggressively materialistic spirit of the modern world was aroused. Through contact with newly discovered countries men's minds were fired by a zeal for discovery, by a curiosity, an enthusiasm for learning the utmost about the new and the strange, a craving to see and examine things which led to the creation of large collections of curiosities and to botanical gardens, followed by a fad for experimentation, and, in the seventeenth century, for accurate statistics. From these various steps arose a modern experimental science; and the demands of world trade and the greater intermixture of peoples in cities resultant, led to that keen, practical bent of mind which produced modern mechanical inventions.

Again, it was the distant lands which gave Europe the greater variety of luxuries and even the comforts of life. It led to the rise of the bourgeois, the leaders in the battle for constitutional liberty. It also produced the rivalries, wars, and selfish imperialism of the modern world. In strange contrast, arose world-wide missionary and philanthropic endeavor; a feeling of responsibility for the downpressed and the suffering in all parts of the world; of tolerance, and a cosmopolitanism which has tended to break down narrow, selfish nationalism, and, at the very present moment, to produce, we hope, at least the beginnings of a desire for true cooperation and brotherhood.



---

---

## VI. ANCIENT HISTORY

---

---



# RECENT ADVANCES IN OUR KNOWLEDGE OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE

(Abstract of paper)

By A. E. R. BOAK, University of Michigan

This paper seeks to present in brief form some of the newer points of view upon the general aspects of the history of the Roman Empire. It does not attempt a detailed discussion of any special problem or a criticism of any particular works.

The topics discussed are the following:

The constitutional theory of the principate: A dyarchy, a restoration of the republic, or a combination of republic and monarchy.

The principate as a magistracy: The Augustan as opposed to the Caesarian view.

The imperial cult in its political significance: Its relation to the Christian persecutions.

The influence of Egypt upon the Empire.

The growth of the bureaucracy.

The origin of the Colonate.

The provincialization and the barbarization of the Roman army.

The religious transformation of the Roman world, through the spread of the oriental cults and Christianity. The survival of the older Graeco-Roman religion.

The political significance of Mithraism.

The influence of the revived Persian Empire upon the the later Roman Empire.

---

## THE EARLY ROMAN EMPIRE AS A CONTINUATION OF THE REPUBLIC

(Abstract of paper)

By FRANK BURE MARSH, University of Texas

The sources, on which the narrative history of the early Empire is based, are all the productions of men who lived in the age of the Antonines or even later. This fact should warn us to be on our guard against the possibility that these writers may have carried back into the past the ideas and usages of their own day. That they have sometimes done this there are concrete instances to show. Thus, for example, Professor McFayden, in an article in *Classical Philology* for January of this year, has shown that the constantly repeated statement that when Augustus laid down the consulship his proconsular imperium was declared maius, and so superior to

that of all the other provincial governors, is a mistake of Dio Cassius who has here projected back into the reign of Augustus a constitutional rule of a much later date.

The distortion of history which results from looking at the principate through the eyes of men of the middle Empire is, however, much more far-reaching and general than can be tested by any definite issues of specific fact. The whole point of view from which we are to consider the institutions of the early Empire is involved. The problems presented by the reign of Augustus will take a different form if we approach them from the side of the Republic. As an illustration of this we may consider for a moment the much debated question of how far Augustus was sincere in his boasted restoration of the republic. Gardthausen contends that the emperor was a deliberate hypocrite and the restoration an elaborate mockery, while, on the other side, Eduard Meyer maintains that he was well-intentioned and of honest purpose. Gardthausen replies to Meyer by asking why, if Augustus wished to restore the senate, he did not do so. As thus put, the question cuts the Empire sharply off from the past. If it were viewed as a continuation of the republic the problem would rather take this form: Why was it that the senate lost power in the first place; and were the forces that had overthrown it still too strong to permit of a genuine restoration? The ruin of the Republic was obviously due to the failure of the senate to control and dominate the army. But this was a condition that existed long before the birth of Augustus. Was it a condition which he had it in his power to remedy? Could he, by an edict, have given the conscript fathers a real hold on the loyalty of the legions? If not, in what sense could the senate be restored to the control of the destinies of the world?

The question of the personal sincerity of Augustus, though interesting, is not of great importance. For history, the real problem is the explanation of the settlement which he imposed upon the world. In the organization of the principate he was deliberately attempting to conciliate and satisfy the public opinion of his day, and to understand his measures we must first see clearly what it was that his contemporaries demanded. To do this, we must approach the principate of Augustus from the standpoint of the Republic of Cicero and Pompey. The ideas of men were drawn, then as now, from the past, with which they were familiar, rather than from the future, which they could not know. Meyer in his last book, *Caesars Monarchie*, has rightly emphasized the fact that the constitution of the early Empire was based far more on the career of Pompey, who led the republicans, than on that of Caesar, who is usually reckoned as its founder.

The Republic of Cicero was essentially an aristocratic one wherein the nobility was to govern through the senate. Its restoration must

have meant, in large part at any rate, the return of the nobles to power and office, from both of which they had been thrust by the civil wars. In this sense, certainly, Augustus did restore the Republic. An examination of the consular fasti of his reign, and of the kind of men through whom he administered his provinces and to whom he intrusted the command of his armies, will show this very clearly. Here may lie an answer to some of the objections raised against his sincerity by Gardthausen. Thus the German scholar regards the shortening of the consular term of office, in the last years of the reign, as a subtle device of the emperor to undermine the vitality of those republican forms under which his monarchy was more or less concealed. Another explanation is at least possible. In the first years of his reign the emperor made little use of nobles of the highest rank in governing his provinces. When, however, the rounding out of the frontiers had increased the number of those provinces, and, at the same time, the deaths in his own family had removed some of the men on whom he had relied, he found himself obliged either to employ a much larger number of consuls than before or to break decidedly with the republican tradition of aristocratic government. From 22 to 13 B. C. we know of only three men of this rank of the nobility in the imperial service, while in the last 13 years of the reign we have the names of at least 18 such men so employed.

Not only was the republican ideal and tradition aristocratic in character, but the old nobility itself passed on into the Empire. The civil wars and the proscriptions made less of a break than might have been expected. The consular fasti place this fact beyond all doubt. From 26 to 13 B. C. out of 28 men (besides the emperor himself) who held the highest magistracy of the restored Republic no less than 11 almost certainly came from old consular families, 4 were probably members of such families, 3 were promoted from the lower ranks of the old republican nobility, and 3 were men who had fought on the side of the republicans in the civil wars and so may reasonably be assumed to have represented the ideas and ideals of the old optimate party of Cicero. Thus, 21 out of the 28 were men who must, both by family tradition and personal sentiment, have served to link the government of the new Empire very closely and vitally to the aristocracy which the civil wars had overthrown.

It will thus be seen that Augustus made a serious effort to conform his settlement of the world to the old republican tradition and to employ the old nobility in the administration of his empire. If his reign is to be rightly understood, it must be considered in the light of these facts and must be viewed not as a new beginning or the opening of a new era but, as what it claimed to be, a continuation of the old Republic.

## NEW EVIDENCE FROM THE PAPYRI

(Abstract of paper)

By C. H. OLDFATHER, Wabash College

The first decades of the twentieth century may be termed the period of the papyri. Some 10,000 documents have already been discovered, of which one-half have been edited. About one-third of this number fall between the Battle of Actium and the division of the Empire under Diocletian. Only a very few of these treat of affairs outside the province of Egypt. Of these the most unexpected are two edicts of Germanicus, occasioned by his visit to Egypt in 19 A. D. They throw a new light on the estrangement between Tiberius and Germanicus. More important in its general bearing is a copy of the edict of Caracalla bestowing citizenship upon the Roman world. The discovery of the *Constitutio Antoniniana* itself now proves that the *dediticii* were excepted, and in Egypt this meant fully three-fourths of the population. This broadening of the suffrage was clearly in order to secure additional revenue.

Especially valuable is the intimate contact with the common people of antiquity. This is noted especially in the great number of private letters.

For the organization of Egypt under the Empire the knowledge is full and detailed. Especially interesting is the comparison of the Roman administration with that of the Ptolemies. Rome showed no willingness to better the economic conditions of Egypt. The situation of the country became steadily worse under the Empire, and the foundation was laid for the later Byzantine servile state.

In conclusion, it was pointed out that the economic condition of the fellahin under Rome was better than obtained in modern Egypt before the Great War.

---

---

## VII. MEDIEVAL HISTORY

---

---



## GUIDO BONATTI, AN ASTROLOGER OF THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY MENTIONED BY DANTE

(Abstract of paper)

By LYNN THORNDIKE, Western Reserve University

The Dante anniversary serves to remind us that medieval enthusiasts have hitherto centered attention too much on a few great personalities like Dante, Roger Bacon, St. Francis, and Chaucer; and that the beginnings of modern literatures have been overstudied to the neglect of their mother, the richer and more scholarly Latin literature.

Guido Bonatti was placed by Dante in the eighth circle of the Inferno for having pried too far into the future. Legend—that like Dante he was an exile from Florence, though he called himself a native of Forli. In 1282 he played a leading part in the successful defense of Forli by Guido of Montefeltro against the papal troops of Martin IV. Legend—that he followed Guido of Montefeltro into a Franciscan convent. Bonatti's career dates back as early as 1223; his mention of Ezzelino and John of Vicenza.

Bonatti's *Liber astronomicus* was the most important Latin work of astrology in the thirteenth century. Its devout opening, clarity of exposition, fulness of treatment, extensive use of classical and Arabic astrologers. Arabic science began to influence the Latin West, not in the thirteenth or twelfth century, but in the tenth and eleventh centuries. Discovery of manuscripts of Gerbert's time which prove this. Prominence of astrology in this first transfer of Arabic science.

Dante's consigning Bonatti's soul to hell seems not to have checked the circulation of the *Liber astronomicus*. Among many manuscripts of it extant is a de luxe copy made for the use of Henry VII of England and containing his picture. Four printed editions of the Latin text; translations into Italian, German, and English, the last as late as 1676. The order and subdivisions of the work vary somewhat in different copies. Its discussion of nativities, revolutions, interrogations, and elections.

General belief in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries in the government of terrestrial nature by the superior celestial bodies. H. G. Wells quoted on the emergence of human species and civilization

under changing climatic conditions due to "the attraction of the circling outer planets." In Bonatti's time the question is not whether or no a writer or thinker believed in astrology; rather the question is, to what point did his belief in the influence of the stars reach? Mandonnet has erroneously represented Albertus Magnus and Aquinas as opponents of astrology and occult science.

Bonatti's denunciation of the friars and "self-styled theologians." Stories from Salimbene of his tiffs with the friars. Medieval astrological treatises written by Dominican friars. Indications that astrologers were consulted by the clergy then and as late as 1704. If all the dead who had pried into the future were put into the fourth division of the eighth circle, it must have been much the most densely populated area of the entire Inferno.

## THE INTERNATIONAL STATE OF THE MIDDLE AGES SOME REASONS FOR ITS FAILURE

(Abstract of paper)

By A. C. KREY, University of Minnesota

*Attempts at international control.*—Various efforts were made during the Middle Ages to gain universal peace, among Christian peoples at least. Of these the most successful was the so-called international state which flourished during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

*Powers wielded by international state.*—For two centuries this international organization was able to raise funds and recruit soldiers directly from the people without the intermediation of kings or states. It administered principalities conquered through joint effort. It served as a supreme court for all Christendom with original jurisdiction in cases involving rulers or nations and appellate jurisdiction extending even to the most humble individual. It was able to bring offenders, whether peasant, noble, or king, whether individual or group, to trial and it had the means of executing its judgments. It could and did dethrone kings and emperors, and it was able to make whole nations come to terms. Its weapons were chiefly moral or spiritual, but it could, if necessary, supplement these by force.

*Reaction against excessive feudal warfare.*—This amazing concentration of power in a nonmilitary organization was due chiefly to the reaction of society against the excesses of feudal warfare. The germ of this reaction was planted with the establishment of the Monastery of Cluny in Burgundy. Other monasteries following its model were brought under its control. In its spread it became the means for the effective cooperation of society against private warfare which kings could not, and feudal nobles, mutually distrustful of each other, would not give.

*Means employed to check warfare.*—This organization promoted the Peace of God to place church buildings, peasants, merchants, mills and agricultural implements out of the reach of such warfare, and the Truce of God which set aside certain days on which fighting was forbidden. In successive enactments these measures were greatly expanded. Great nobles and kings were won to support the measure. It became customary for candidates for knighthood to take oath to maintain the Peace of God, the origin of chivalry.

*Papacy won to reform.*—In the middle of the eleventh century this reaction against feudal warfare was so strong and well organized that it was able to wrest the papal office from the control of feudal factions in Rome. Thereafter the popes became leaders in the movement. With the preaching of the first crusade an outlet was furnished to the superabundant fighting zeal of Europe and warfare in the west was rendered less popular.

Thus far the organized moral forces had directed their efforts chiefly against the petty feudal lordlings whose indiscriminate quarrelling had been the chief disturbance. Now under papal leadership it was ready to enforce the Peace of God and Truce of God upon the greater nobles and kings as well. Law was substituted for force as a proper method of settling most disputes and the church courts became models in this work.

*Peace imposed on kings.*—The Crusades aimed originally against the infidel, were now turned against kings and emperors in the west when they proved otherwise refractory, and the machinery for maintaining international peace and order was complete.

The full power of this organization was first revealed by Innocent III. It was maintained practically at that height throughout the thirteenth century when it began perceptibly to decline.

*Causes for decline of international state.*—Among the factors that led to the downfall of this power were, first over-centralization in the papacy at the expense of local churchmen, whose power for good was thereby weakened; second, friction between the various agencies of the church, e. g. monastic, especially the friars, and secular clergy; third, a failure to establish an undivided leadership on its military expeditions; fourth, a failure to win the effective cooperation of the larger commercial interests; fifth, abuse of power by the popes for the sake of power or in the interest of relatives; sixth, the development of national states strong enough to furnish their citizens the peace hitherto sought through the help of the church; and lastly, the renewed influence of Italian states in the election of the papacy. The papal schism and the religious reformation, themselves the outcome of these destructive forces, hastened the collapse of the international state.

As an experiment in practical idealism this international state of the Middle Ages has not as yet been equaled. Never have all the moral forces of an extensive society been so effectively concentrated as they were during the two centuries of its greatness.

## THE TWELFTH AND THIRTEENTH CENTURIES IN THE HISTORY OF CULTURE

(Abstract of paper)

By LOUIS JOHN PAETOW, University of California

About the time of the death of Dante, 600 years ago, western Europe was on the threshold of two literary and linguistic movements which were destined to revolutionize the world of learning. One was the revival of interest in classical Latin and Greek, the other was the conscious effort to make the vernaculars of Europe the vehicle of lofty literary designs.

In both of these Dante played a conspicuous part. Both tended to obscure the Middle Ages—the world of Dante. In this seventh century after Dante we should contribute to the knowledge of Dante and advance modern learning by inaugurating a new literary and linguistic movement, the study of the Latin language and literature of the Middle Ages, especially of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. To do this we must take a bold stand against the judgment of the humanists, who utterly despised the Latin of the Middle Ages.

Our problem is not whether medieval Latin was good, bad, or indifferent. We must see to it that it is studied properly, because such a new literary and linguistic movement would reveal to us the true Middle Ages, and especially the remarkable culture of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Medievalists must insist upon better linguistic tools. They must have a post-classical dictionary, based upon Du Cange, *Glossarium*, but going vastly beyond the limits of that old work. This great task can probably be accomplished in no other way than by reviving Latin as the international language of modern civilization. Considerable progress has been made in this endeavor, and medievalists should cooperate with all other scholars in this world-wide movement.

Dante's outlook was international, but by writing his Divine Comedy in Italian he promoted nationalism, the dominant note of modern history. The new literary and linguistic movement would promote internationalism, which will probably be the keynote of the twentieth century.

The twelfth and thirteenth centuries suffered most in the misinterpretation of the Middle Ages, which was due to the humanists. Further investigation will probably prove that these centuries were as important in laying the foundations of modern civilization as

the fourteenth and fifteenth. Some of the most important features which await further investigation are the expansion of Latin Christendom, Gothic art, the internal history of universities, interest in the Latin classics and in languages other than Latin, the natural sciences and medicine, history of historiography, of political thought, and the freedom of thought. These and other problems will never be understood adequately without a new world-wide literary and linguistic movement which will concern itself with post-classical Latin and perhaps make Latin the international language of the world. Then we shall begin to understand Dante and the age of Dante.

*Discussion.*—FREDERICK DUNCALF, of the University of Texas: The twelfth and thirteenth centuries furnish great opportunities for study of institutional development, as well as for study in the field of pure culture.

The period was a time of conflict of jurisdictions, systems of law, and political ideas. It was also marked by experimentation in institutions. This is illustrated by the military orders.

All of this legal controversy and political activity was a stimulus which must have influenced the intellectuals of the period. For any broad understanding of the awakening of this period, or for an understanding of the later renaissance, both lines of intellectual development must be considered together.

JAMES F. WILLARD, of the University of Colorado, drew attention to the neglect of the study of the administrative history of England in the thirteenth century and emphasized the value of the memoranda and issue rolls to students proposing to work in that field. He also spoke on the rolls of taxation as sources for the study of economic history.

---

---

VIII. CONFERENCE ON ENGLISH HISTORY

---

GENERAL SESSION ON THE HISTORY OF FRANCE

---

---



## RECENT HISTORY TENDENCIES AND A SUGGESTION

(Abstract of paper)

By ARTHUR LYON CROSS, University of Michigan

There were many things that were going on before the war not because they were good and needful but simply because they had been started. The war destroyed much of this; and now there is a desire everywhere for something new. There are dangers in the growing tendency to lay so much emphasis in teaching on recent history and world history. A certain amount of world history is good, but there is such a thing as too rapid progress. Great speed will make history simply journalism writ large. The new spirit is arrogant and without conciliation. We need scholarly methods for modern history and should carefully avoid spreading it out thinly. Attention is called to the advantage of legal history as a teaching instrument.

In a paper on ELECTIONEERING IN THE TIME OF SIR ROBERT WALPOLE, CLARENCE PERKINS, of the University of North Dakota, told of the papers of the Duke of Newcastle. They disclose that the methods of a public man are best revealed by a study of the papers of his political rival.

A paper was read by Prof. C. C. CRAWFORD, of the University of Kansas, on THE STUDY OF ENGLISH LEGAL HISTORY. Professor Crawford emphasized the need of the study of legal history by law students or by college students preparing for the law school.

## TOWN PRIVILEGES UNDER THE ESTABLISHMENTS OF ROUEN

(Abstract of paper)

By EARLE W. Dow, University of Michigan

Our knowledge concerning town conditions as illustrated or affected by the *stabilimenta*, or establishments, of Rouen, is substantially where it was left by Giry and his pupils in the well-known two volumes published now almost 40 years ago: *Les Établissements de Rouen; Études sur l'Histoire des Institutions Municipales de Rouen, Falaise, etc.*, Paris, 1883-1885. One way of advance, it would seem, is to reexamine the principal documents concerned—ducal or royal charters of 1144-1150, 1174, 1199, 1207, 1278, and the communal establishments—with special attention to the general construction of each of the documents and to their relation with each other.

Viewed in this way, the charters of 1144-1150 and 1199 are seen to have two distinct sets of provisions, reflecting two chief aims of the burghers—a definition of their relations with the government in various respects; and the assurance of several advantages in industry and trade, especially trade beyond Rouen. In the charter of 1199 appears also, but not very clearly, a third special aim of the burghers, their commune. The charter of 1207 covers the first two aims with much the same result as did the preceding pieces, and is far more full and specific as to the commune. The *ordonnance* of 1278 bears entirely on matters about the commune. The establishments, for their part, apply almost altogether to the commune; and like the charters show convincing marks of having been constructed in an orderly manner.

The construction of the principal documents and their relation to each other once made out, it becomes possible to know far more definitely about the rôle of the commune at Rouen in matters of law and justice, both in the civil and in the criminal field. It becomes possible also to see more definitely the case and problems of the commune as to organization and efficiency, and as to defense and war. A study of this sort about Rouen derives, of course, a very considerable part of its interest from the wide extent to which the Rouenese establishments were adopted beyond Rouen; in whole, or in some proportion, by at least thirty or so towns of western France, from the Channel to the Pyrennees.

## VOLTAIRE'S PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY

(Abstract of paper)

By ALBERT L. GUÉRARD, Rice Institute

Voltaire is recognized as the founder of modern history. Yet there lurks a prejudice to the effect that he was, if not a mere cynical jester, at any rate nothing higher than a polemist, flippant, unscrupulous, and destructive. This may be true of many of his miscellaneous writings; it is in no sense true of his historical works. In these he showed himself a painstaking, fair-minded scholar, and a thinker of singular power. No doubt his philosophy of history is not of the systematic type; he does not attempt to unfold the Divine plan for the government of the universe; he is no hierophant like Bossuet and Carlyle. But neither should his mind be termed, as Faguet termed it, "a chaos of clear ideas." He has definite criteria of truth and justice. He is a rationalist and a humanitarian. He is in sympathy with the masses of mankind, but he is no democrat. Progress—a slow, uncertain process at best—is, in his opinion, not of the work of the populace but that of *an open aristocracy of enlightened service*, of which he was the conscious type. The enemy that these knights of enlightenment have to fight, the Beast, "l'Infâme," is fanaticism. And the source of their inspiration is to be found not in any dogma but in universal, "natural," religion—Love God and love thy neighbor. The message of Voltaire may sound trite and fit for Philistines. But after the havoc wrought by the romantic reaction, it may not be amiss to reassert it to-day. Seek the truth, do right, worship no idols; in the name of reason and humanity.

Prof. FRED M. FLING, of the University of Nebraska, read a paper on the SIGNIFICANCE OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION.<sup>1</sup>

Monsieur BERNARD FAX, of Paris, discussed the close relations between THE REVOLUTIONARY PHILOSOPHY IN FRANCE AND IN THE UNITED STATES AT THE END OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY<sup>1</sup>—Luzerne's press, Vergennes's *Nouvelles d'Angleterre et d'Amerique*, the manner in which the young French revolutionaries brought American ideas of politics and morals to bear on bourgeois minds (moral ideas more permanent than political), and, after the moral bankruptcy of the directory, the manner in which Madame de Stael, Benjamin Constant, Chateaubriand used their ideas of American society in their efforts toward a new Catholicism.

Prof. CHARLES D. HAZEN, of Columbia University, described THE PART FRANCE HAS PLAYED IN LIBERATING OTHER NATIONS<sup>1</sup>—Greece, Belgium, Rumania, and Italy.

---

<sup>1</sup> No abstracts furnished.



---

---

IX. MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY: EUROPE AFTER  
THE CONGRESS OF VIENNA

---

---



## A CRITICISM OF THE ITALIAN SETTLEMENT OF 1815

(Abstract of paper)

By WILLIAM A. FRAYER, University of Michigan

Italy in 1815 had no man sufficiently able to be a ruler, and redivision of Italy into individual states was the only possible solution. It was therefore a condition and not a theory which had to be met. The balance of power seemed the best plan available. The peoples of Europe were parceled out and moral forces neglected. The old diplomacy in 1815 was as unsound as it is now; yet the settlement might easily have been worse.

## NATIONALISM AND THE METTERNICH SYSTEM

(Abstract of paper)

By R. J. KERNER, University of Missouri

Our generation may learn much from the era of Metternich, which is the name often given to the generation after the Napoleonic wars. It will be the task of historians, economists, and sociologists to synthesize the fast-accumulating knowledge on this very important epoch of human history. Enough is known about it to cast considerable light on the trend of prices and the differing rate of recovery of agrarian and industrial countries after such shocks to the economic fabric as the Napoleonic wars. Our task here has not been to outline the economic phases of the subject but rather as historians to point out that the complete system of repression which Metternich endeavored to spread over Europe in order to save the Hapsburg Empire from dissolution could not and did not destroy the forces of nationalism and democracy. All repressive measures, this period teaches us, had only temporary effects and mostly bad ones at that. The more that public opinion, the press, the universities, and the normal intellectual life of the awakening nations were repressed the more rabid became their radicalism; the more secret societies sprang up the less political experience and sound judgment the leaders and the masses had. The effects of this repressive system on the intellect, on the cultural and literary instincts of the nations, and on their artistic activities are only now being analyzed.

No historian will declare that nationalism and democracy have not gone forward triumphantly in Europe since the days of Metternich. If he reads history aright, he sees the same process taking place further to the east in Europe and in Asia. The system of Metternich could delay the evolution of nationalism and democracy for a generation or two only. It did so, however, at a frightful expense to both the preventor and the prevented. It is exceedingly doubtful whether statesmen in an age like ours can do more than or as much as Metternich when they approach the problems of eastern Europe and Asia. Their task is rather to prepare a safe roadbed along which these forces may run their normal course in evolution rather than with revolution. Their future task will be to bring about the necessary compromise between new nations living for the most part in an agricultural stage of evolution and which seek to be free politi-

cally and the older more fortunate nations which have already become industrialized in an age when economic isolation is fast becoming an impossibility.

These statesmen will not be able to reconcile the separating forces of nationalism with the uniting forces of the economic evolution by denying the existence of nationalism or by discrediting its character, but rather by utilizing and controlling and directing it for the higher purposes of civilization. Properly conceived, nationalism means the end of imperialism and a demand for copartnership in the affairs of the world.

The era of Metternich also teaches us that both reaction and radicalism impede and discredit progress. Metternich was able to justify, at least superficially, his repressive measures on the basis of the violent outbursts which occurred in the years between 1817 and 1821. These were acts for the most part of misguided radicals and did not at all represent the sober demand for steady, peaceful progress, which was the wish of the vast majority.

In 1848 Metternich fled from Vienna in a washerwoman's cart, after a generation of propping up of the old order. He left behind him a corpse, the Hapsburg Empire, which Francis Joseph endeavored in 1867 to galvanize into life by timely concessions to the Magyars, thus making the Germans and the Magyars copartners in Austro-Hungarian imperialism (over six other nations). Metternich, however, was in no doubt about what had transpired when the revolutions of 1848 had broken loose. He then wrote his friend Kuebeck: "I do not see an Austrian empire any more. *It is dissolved.* The task is no longer to preserve, to maintain what was, *but to build anew.*" He had seen the light too late, but he was on the right track at last.

His successors in Austria and Russia failed to learn from these events. In 1848, Nicholas I of Russia, the complete reactionary on whose shoulders had fallen the discredited burden of Metternich, penned a famous manifesto. It wound up with the following tactless, but fateful, words: "God is with us! Beware, O Nations, and humble yourselves, for God is with us." To-day, the descendants of the proud families of the Hapsburgs, the Hohenzollerns, and the Romanovs are homeless. They had failed to learn the lesson which Metternich's era had so plainly taught.

PARKER T. MOON, of Columbia University, read a paper on **BRITISH JEALOUSY OF FRENCH IMPERIALISM AFTER 1815**. The points covered were the attitude of the different English and French toward the Madagascar and Barbary State questions; the recovery of power by France in 1830; and the effects of the aggressive policies of France in stimulating the English opposition.

The paper entitled **THE JULY DAYS AND AFTER**, by Prof. J. M. S. ALLISON, of Yale University, was devoted to an explanation of the

failure of the government of Louis Philippe. Professor Allison touched upon the powers of the Chamber and the Hôtel de Ville; Lafayette's temporizing which resulted in giving France a new charter; the reception accorded Louis Philippe (his coming was believed at the time to be the advent of an "Era of Liberty"); the personnel of the compromise ministry; and labor conditions. It was not the laborers who wrecked the government, but the radicals who had become effervescent under the unstable government and finally made a general attack upon the entire control. The radicals disagreed both as to methods and details. It was this unorganized radical movement that saved Paris. There were all sorts of radical clubs, the Friends of the People being the most important. This in 1848 was composed of students, men out of work, etc. The Friends were practically sovereign with respect to the many other societies. They had a propaganda bureau, and one newspaper. They, however, outdid themselves by going ahead too rapidly. No definite policy accounts for the catastrophe that came to France in 1848.

*Discussion.*—HENRY R. SHIPMAN, of Princeton University: As one looks back from the standpoint of 1921 to the period in European history from 1815 to 1848, one thinks not as one would have in 1913, for the League of Nations project has made us consider anew Metternich's and Alexander's confederation of Europe. The famous remark that "Republics are no longer fashionable" brings a whimsical smile in the face of the crop of young republics on the Baltic and elsewhere. Republics may even be soviet republics, although the disappointed Genoese delegation, who approached the Tsar, were not thinking of such a form of government by the people.

All writers of recent date upon the Congress of Vienna agree that the Congress made a bad mistake in ignoring the rights of nationalities. The history of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries has been marked by the growth of nationalism; and nationalism and liberalism have progressed hand in hand.

Lord Robert Cecil recently denounced the spirit of nationalism as the main source of all the sufferings and mischiefs which the people of Europe are now enduring. How far was he right?

Nationalism has often transformed itself into a false patriotism. It has bred national vanity; in its name states fight for a place in the sun and arm for a "yellow peril"; militarism and imperialism follow in its shadow; it has become a power through which the authorities may exploit the people. There are wheels within wheels in the complex questions of nationalities, and national boundaries are hard to draw, with the best intentions in the world on the part of the drawers.

Mazzini wished to make a new Italy, but also wished to make a new Europe. The foundation of the Young Italy society was followed by that of Young Europe. In his "General instructions (for the initiators)," dated 1834, he defined Young Europe as "an association of men believing in a future of liberty, equality, and fraternity for all mankind, and desirous of consecrating their thoughts and actions to the realization of that future." "Humanity will only be truly constituted when all the peoples of which it is composed have acquired the free exercise of their sovereignty and shall be associated

in a Republican confederation, governed and directed by a common declaration of principles and a common pact toward the common aim—the discovery and fulfillment of the universal moral law.” He also said that “a school of *soi-disant* cosmopolitans do not destroy nationality, they only confiscate all other nationalities for the benefit of their own. A chosen people, a Napoleonic people, is the last word of all their systems; and all their negations of nationality bear within them the germ of an usurping nationalism; usurping—if not by force of arms, which is not so easy at the present day—by the assumption of a permanent, exclusive, moral, and intellectual initiative, which is quite as dangerous to those peoples weak enough to admit it as any other form of usurpation.”

Mazzini foresaw the crimes that might be committed in the name of nationalism and pinned his faith on an association of peoples. He also foresaw the claims that a “chosen people” might put forward. What he did not see was that liberty, equality, fraternity, confederation, universal moral law, all must be definite ideas. They can not be expressed in the same terms in every age. After they have been defined a political mechanism must be devised to secure them. And the nineteenth century can not boast of the success of its political machinery in realizing ideals.

Should not we look at nationalism as a necessary stage in the fight to do away with privilege and the denial of equal freedom and opportunity to all men? Has it not been serviceable in doing away with some injustices and some inequalities? May it not still be so in the future? But has not the idea largely outlived its usefulness? Have not the results of the accomplishment of nationalism been so harmful economically that the world will be forced to abandon the patriot's slogans? How long will nationalism be considered a beneficent force?

Prof. CARLTON J. H. HAYES, of Columbia University, discussed “Liberalism,” which, he asserted, did not mean an economic doctrine nor a patriotic enthusiasm, but rather an economic theory that arose in the French school and thrived during a machine epoch in western Europe.

Prof. BERNADOTTE SCHMITT, of Western Reserve University, raised the questions, How real was nationalism at Vienna? Why did nationalism not show itself for a generation after 1815? The explanation was that there was no proletariat to carry it on before that time. Nationalism was due to an economic revolution rather than to Metternich's repressive measures.

Prof. LAWRENCE B. PACKARD, of Rochester University, urged students not to take a too objective point of view. Metternich represented a desire on the part of the people for a return to normalcy.

---

---

X. CONFERENCE ON THE HISTORY OF THE FAR EAST

---

CONFERENCE ON HISPANIC-AMERICAN HISTORY

---

---



## THE HISTORY OF THE FAR EAST

Prof. M. I. ROSTOVITZEFF, of the University of Wisconsin, sketched the history of the influence of the art of Central Asia on South Russia and China.<sup>1</sup>

A paper was read on PRINCE SHOTOKU AND THE TAIKWA REFORM IN JAPAN IN 645 A. D., by LANGDON WARNER, director of the Pennsylvania Museum at Philadelphia.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>No abstract furnished.

## HISPANIC-AMERICAN HISTORY

---

### MATERIALS FOR SPANISH HISTORY IN THE GENARO GARCÍA LIBRARY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

(Abstract of paper)

By CHARLES W. HACKETT, University of Texas

During the summer of 1921 the University of Texas, at an approximate cost of \$110,000, acquired the private collection of Mexicana of the late Genaro García—until the time of his death Mexico's foremost historical writer, editor, and bibliophile. This collection contains approximately 11,000 printed volumes, 15,000 pamphlets, numerous files, some of them practically complete, of Mexican and Spanish newspapers and periodicals, and 400,000 pages of manuscript materials, this latter including the private archives of 10 of Mexico's leading statesmen and patriots of the nineteenth century.

In the García collection are books relating to the technique of history, to philosophy, to religion, to law, to philology, to science and fine arts, and to literature. The bulk of the material, however, is historical; in fact, approximately 5,000 printed items alone relate to the historical evolution of Mexico since 1810. The purpose of this paper, however, was to describe in general those materials in the section of history in the García collection which relate directly to the history of Spain.

In such a distinctive collection of Mexicana it is not surprising that there are not to be found comprehensive collections of books relating to all phases and periods of Spanish history. On the other hand there are in the collection, first, the more general secondary and the printed primary materials; second, rare and unique works which such a collector and bibliophile as Sr. García would have the opportunity of acquiring from time to time; and, finally, such works as are particularly important for the Spanish background of colonial history. In fact, the most valuable of the materials for Spanish history in the García collection relate to the period from 1500 to 1821. After the latter date, when the Spanish background for Mexican history had practically disappeared, there are few works in the collection which relate to Spanish history in that period. In all approximately 750 books are accounted for and about the same number of pamphlets which relate directly to the history of Spain. This, however, is not an absolute estimate of the number of each.

The works as listed were divided into the following groups: (1) Bibliographies, catalogues, guides to historical materials, law codes, and dictionaries; (2) works relating to the general history and geography of Spain; (3) works relating to Spain from earliest times to 1500; (4) works relating to the Hapsburg period, 1500-1700; (5) works relating to the Bourbon period between the years 1700 and 1808; (6) works relating to the Spanish revolt against Napoleon and the period of the rebellion of Spain's colonies, 1808-1821; (7) biographies; (8) more pertinent religious works and works relating to the Inquisition; (9) works relating to sociology and economic matters; (10) works of literature; (11) works relating to Spain in the period since 1821; and (12) miscellaneous works.

The character of the works in each of the above sections is described in general terms, while the rarer items or older prints are described more fully; also the number of books and pamphlets to be found in each section was given. The three sections containing materials relating to events from 1500 to 1821 are the most complete. The first two of these sections are distinctive because of the number and character of the modern as well as older secondary works, and because of small but unique collections of pamphlets and periodicals. The third of these sections is valuable because of exceedingly important and rare official publications, because of several unique and practically complete files of rare periodicals, and, finally, because of a most valuable collection of between 500 and 600 pamphlets which were collected by Don Lucas Alamán while he was engaged in gathering materials for his monumental history of the Mexican war of independence.

The other section into which the materials for Spanish history in the García collection were grouped are described only in very general terms.

# THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE VICEROYALTY IN THE NEW WORLD—A PROJECTION OF SPANISH INSTITUTIONS

(Abstract of paper)

By ARTHUR S. ATON, University of Michigan

Fresh data gathered in the Archivo General de Indias in Seville, in particular from the complete papers of the general visita made by Francisco Tello de Sandoval, throws a flood of light on social, political, and economic affairs in New Spain under the first viceroy. The new facts make it more than ever apparent that Antonio de Mendoza, as the creator of the rôle of viceroy in the New World, deserves to be better known. His work included the establishment of stable government, the completion of the conquest of Mexico, the organization of social, political, and economic life, and the promotion of important discovery and colonization. That he should share, with Cortés, the credit of founding New Spain is no exaggeration of the merit and influence of his labors.

The viceroyalty was an old Spanish institution projected into the New World under the supervision of Mendoza. The viceroy had long been used in Spain proper to govern various kingdoms and in the exercise of rule over such outlying possessions as Sardinia, Sicily, and Naples. When the audiencia, employed successfully in the West Indies, failed to cope satisfactorily with the problems of a great area and the control of semicivilized peoples in New Spain, viceregal rule, with its precedents and prestige, was successfully superimposed upon it.

Some of the conclusions reached concerning the period of adjustment occasioned by the introduction of the viceroyalty into New Spain are that the Sandoval visita was of greater importance and extent than hitherto suspected, and was, in large part, the result of a well-planned attempt on the part of Cortés to oust the viceroy; that the enforcement of the new laws would have meant the desertion of New Spain by Spanish settlers, for all work ceased on March 23, 1544, prices soared (wheat, for example, to eleven reales a fanega), and 600 settlers, including 40 families, prepared to leave by the fleet which sailed in June; that there were significant beginnings in manufacture, agriculture, and stockraising; and that there were noteworthy social developments, such as the elaboration of governmental machinery to protect free Indian labor and to fix just wages.

In the papers concerning voyages and expeditions during the period of the viceroy Mendoza is an account which clears up the mystery of the great paucity of material bearing on the Cabrillo-Ferrelo voyage. The sailors on their return from the California voyage were engaged by the viceroy to undertake the rescue of the Villalobos expedition, but, while the armada was being prepared, they were sent to Peru with three shiploads of mares and colts from Mendoza's ranches. These vessels were lost at sea and the men who knew about the earlier voyage with them. Hence the Juan Plez diary is likely to remain the only source at the historian's disposal.

## THE POLICY OF SPAIN TOWARD HER REVOLTED COLONIES IN 1823-1824

(Abstract of paper)

By WILLIAM S. ROBERTSON, University of Illinois

This paper was a study, based in considerable part upon material from the archives of England and Spain, of the attitude of the Spanish Government toward its American colonies just after French soldiers, acting on behalf of the Holy Alliance, had restored Ferdinand VII to absolute power. The paper presented the view that the holy allies strove in certain ways to reduce the rigor of Ferdinand's internal policy and that, in general, they favored the adoption by Ferdinand VII of a conciliatory policy toward the revolted Spanish colonies. The author had not found evidence to show that the Holy Alliance had agreed in 1823-1824 to intervene to restore the authority of Ferdinand VII in Spanish America although his Secretary of State had written a dispatch asking it to intervene by force. Through the influence of the envoys of the holy allies at the court of Madrid that reactionary secretary was actually replaced by a moderate statesman on December 2, 1823.

---

---

## XI. AMERICAN HISTORY

---

---



## CONFERENCE ON AMERICAN COLONIAL HISTORY

*Discussion:* Prof. W. T. Root, of the University of Wisconsin, asserted that eighteenth-century history, in the past, had been a much neglected field. He mentioned and discussed a number of subjects that needed investigation, such as financial relations between England and the colonies, relation of colonial development of Parliament system, merchants and English creditors, a study of colonial laws and royal orders, etc.

Prof. B. W. Bond, Jr., of the University of Cincinnati, stated that in his study of the colonial agent he had centered his investigations upon the southern colonies and Maryland, and had included the chief printed sources together with the manuscript material available in the Library of Congress. He had also made a partial study of Pennsylvania and had taken up the subject in general fashion as to the remaining colonies and especially New England. The most important manuscript material he had investigated was the correspondence of Charles Garth, agent for South Carolina, and for brief periods for Georgia and Maryland also. These letters are an excellent illustration of the value and functions of a colonial agent. Comparable to them in this respect are the various editions of the letters of Benjamin Franklin. The Garth correspondence is also valuable as giving the point of view of a member of Parliament who was decidedly sympathetic toward the colonies during the momentous debates of 1765-1774.

It would seem that in the royal and proprietary colonies the colonial agent, as the spokesman of the elective branch of the assembly, was an exceedingly important officer. Invariably the appointive branch, the governor and the council, attempted to control, for obvious reasons, both the selection of the agent and his conduct in office. Especially bitter was the struggle in Maryland, where the proprietary influence was exerted to prevent the selection of an agent who would be responsible to the lower house alone and thus would be able to present popular grievances to the Crown. Similar struggles developed in other colonies.

Professor Bond referred to the Old West as a rich field for historical research. Historically speaking, the Old West, Januslike, faces in two directions; toward the older seaboard colonies and toward the newer trans-Appalachian region. The historian, like the pioneer farmer, had almost forsaken those barren ridges and scanty valleys, preferring the fertile stretches of the tidewater and of the Mississippi Valley. The result has been a most regrettable break in the scientific explanation of American development.

From the standpoint of the older seaboard colonies, the political, the economic, and the social, including especially the racial, the development of the Old West is of the utmost importance. In fact, without a careful investigation of these details the political history of the older colonies in the eighteenth century can not be adequately explained. Virginia may be taken as a case in point. In general fashion we know that western Virginia was inhabited chiefly by Scotch-Irish and Germans, and that their landholdings were much smaller and less fertile than those of the tidewater planters. Also, there is a generally accepted belief that they were more democratic than the aristocratic landholders of eastern Virginia, and that they held fewer slaves and were

opposed to the established church. These traditional views explain such a man as Thomas Jefferson and are doubtless correct in the main. Yet, the economic and social history of Piedmont and Appalachian Virginia has never been scientifically worked out, even though such an intensive study is necessary if the ultimate separation of West Virginia from the Old Dominion is to be explained in really thorough and scientific fashion.

From the standpoint of the trans-Appalachian region, western Virginia may be taken as typical of the relations between the Old West and the pioneer settlements of the great Mississippi Valley. Without an understanding of the point of view of the characteristics of the people of western Virginia there can be no adequate explanation of the Kentucky pioneers. A similar analysis of western Pennsylvania is equally important to explain the hardy Scotch-Irish pioneers of the upper Ohio, and only through an understanding of western North Carolina can we account for the type of men in early Tennessee and Kentucky. Unless, then, the Old West is carefully explained, the foundations are missing from the story of the Northwest and the Southwest.

A phase of the old West was the English fur trade into the Appalachians and beyond in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. From a wide variety of sources we know that the hardy English fur trader crossed the ridge as early as the seventeenth century, but many gaps remain to be filled, and no attempt has been made to give a general view of the subject. In colonial archives and collections, probably in the Public Record Office and among the manuscripts of the Society for Propagating the Gospel, the historical investigator should find a rich store of material. It has been frequently said that there is no romance in the history of the English occupation of America. But here is a subject equally as absorbing and important as the stories of the Spanish conquistadores or the French Coureurs de bois.

American colonial history has explored in fairly thorough fashion the region between the Appalachians and the Atlantic coast. It must now penetrate those mountain barriers, and even cross over them into the great valley beyond. Only by this means can the continuity of American history, involving Anglo-Saxon expansion, be maintained.

Prof. LAURENCE H. GIPSON, of Wabash College, emphasized the opportunity for studies in eighteenth century colonial biography. He said that few of the published lives of colonial leaders were of a satisfactory nature because of the fact that the writers of these had not approached their task with adequate preparation, as a rule, or were not mentally fitted for this type of historical composition; that the writer of a successful institutional study might not be qualified to deal with the problems of human personality. In this connection he pointed out the necessity of suppressing the trivial and of giving due appreciation to diverse and complex environmental factors influencing the actions of men. Professor Gipson also pointed out that the field of local colonial history was almost a virgin field for students of American history; that few of the numerous town histories had been written with the aid of a broad and critical background and that the writing of a really successful town history was a challenge to the finest powers that a historian possesses and that many of the colonial towns had a history, as yet to be fittingly written, worthy of the most serious attention on the part of those adequately equipped for the task. He then pointed out the diverse character of the materials that must be employed in such an undertaking.

Prof. M. W. JERNEGAN, of the University of Chicago, said that the possibility of any large increase in our knowledge of the history of the American colonies in the eighteenth century depends first, on research in unworked fields, and

second, in the use of new or little-used sources. Because so much work has been done on the colonies, considered as part of the empire, and on the individual history of the separate colonies, it would seem as if the largest contribution in the future would come from studies of a comparative nature on the internal development of the colonies, especially along economic and social lines.

We need more detailed explanations of the larger problems and movements of the eighteenth century, such as the balance of trade, the diversification and westward movements, the growth of dissatisfaction with both British and tidewater control, and the internal revolution, political, economic, social, and religious, that paralleled the movement for independence and was closely related to it.

As an aid to the interpretation of such topics, as well as for the value of the knowledge for its own sake, we need comparative studies on the development of local taxation, its nature and extent; of certain manufactures, such as those based on the lumber and livestock industries; and on the land question, particularly soil exhaustion, the production of cereals, and the problem of large estates in relation to land hunger, dissatisfaction, and democracy.

In the field of social history there is a great need of comparative studies of the mental traits and intellectual capacity of the colonists, by colonies and sections, including such topics as folklore, literary output of all kinds, character of reading, and especially educational organization and progress through public, church, and private agencies. In the religious field, comparative studies are needed of the number, location, and kind of religious congregations and their activities, especially in relation to the revolution and social progress. The study of the relations of religious and political liberalism; of the relation of religious forces to the settlement of the back country, to the development of sectionalism, to religious liberty, to antislavery, and to educational activities, will yield rich results.

There are large groups of sources, printed and manuscript, that have as yet been little explored for these purposes. Among them are the thousands of volumes of the files of the colonial newspaper press, the manuscript local records—parish, town, and county—90 per cent of which, perhaps, are still unpublished, and the large mass of unpublished religious records. With the additional light thrown on these subjects by the Carnegie Institution guides to material in foreign archives bearing on American history, it is clear that the eighteenth century is still an important field for research, for the discovery of new knowledge from largely unused sources.

Prof. DIXON R. FOX, of Columbia University, told of the probable publication, during the year, of the late Professor Osgood's volumes, and of the acquisition of the Livingston papers that, with little difficulty, could be consulted by students.

Prof. ISAAC J. COX, of the University of Cincinnati, spoke of the need for the teaching of Spanish and French colonial history of the United States, together with the English colonies, as an aid to the proper understanding of the development of the English colonies.

Prof. HERBERT K. BOLTON urged the necessity of the use of the great and valuable collection of Spanish manuscripts, relating to the colonial history of the United States to be found in the many volumes of the Bancroft collection.

Mrs. N. M. M. SURREY, of the Carnegie Institution, Department of Historical Research, spoke of the need of a generous use of French manuscript material in the Library of Congress as an aid in understanding the development of the English colonies, especially as to the relations of the English, Spanish, and French in connection with the east and west Florida question.

# THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION VIEWED IN THE LIGHT OF THE LAST TWO DECADES OF RESEARCH

(Abstract of paper)

By C. H. VAN TYNE, University of Michigan

Not until generations after the Revolutionary War were the pages of even sober historians free from the false traditions which hate had engendered. Even George Bancroft wrote of the Americans of 1776 as "chosen to keep guard over the liberties of mankind." It was against this sort of hero-worship that Sydney George Fisher directed his sarcasm; but he ignored his scholarly contemporaries and, in changing the old historiography of the Revolution, he tended to go too far.

Aside from Fisher and Belcher, the English historian of like animus, much serious scholarly work in revolutionary history has been done during the last 20 years. The general tendency has been to find the causes of the rupture in economic conditions and administrative weakness. I can not go the lengths that some have gone in this direction, but believe that the religious and social controversies and differences played a large part.

Dr. George Louis Beer has contributed much to the knowledge of the fundamental causes. He traced the development of the principles which governed the control of the colonies to the ultimate formation of a colonial system and gave for the first time the point of view of the men, officials, and lawmakers, charged with responsibility for it; their view that the British Government owed naval and frontier defense, that the colonies in turn owed obedience and conformity with the laws passed by Parliament. He showed that the strain of the Seven Years' War left England unable to bear these expenses and led British statesmen to resort to a tax by Parliament.

In Prof. C. W. Alvord's "Mississippi Valley in British Politics" he has brought out the bearing of the problem of the West and the policies of the ministry in that regard upon the conflict over taxation. Professor Becker, besides contributing subtle and new interpretations, has set forth the character of the social classes in the Colony of New York and the political power and affiliations of the great families. Professor Schlesinger made the first clear statement of the attitude of traders and merchants whose welfare was closely related to that of England, showing that until 1773 they worked successfully to stem the tide of radical measures.

The total results of two decades of research are perhaps best stated by Prof. C. M. Andrews in his "Colonial Period" and in "Present day thoughts on the American Revolution," in the *University of Georgia Bulletin* (1919). He depicts the lower classes in England, which, unlike the colonists, did not question the rule of privilege, and the upper and privileged class, with its obsession for legality, its fear of reform of a venerated system. The very growth of the British Empire made its statesmen study how to unify and centralize; while Americans, unconcerned with the interests of the empire, aimed at greater freedom and self-government.

As the result of the quiet search for truth of these and other workers, including Tyler, Flick, Siebert, Justin Smith, Eckenrode, Hatch, Paullin, Edler, and Corwin, our knowledge of the Revolution and its causes has been greatly advanced. We have come better to understand the divergent influences that shaped the ends to which each country was moving. Americans starting with an English-born political philosophy developed in a new environment new ways of attaining the freedom at which that philosophy aimed. The Revolution was therefore the finest fruit of the Englishman's long struggle for liberty.

## IN RE THE AMERICAN PEOPLE VS. GEORGE III

(Abstract of paper)

By CLARENCE WALWORTH ALVORD, University of Minnesota

The older method of proving George III responsible for the revolt of the American Colonies by ascribing to his influence only those parts of the new British colonial policy which aroused the anger of the Colonies should now be discarded. Most of the new phases of the new policy had been decided upon before George III became king. The imperial ideas of the British administration can best be discovered by a study of the platform of the Chatham ministry, which represented those ideas at their best; but there is need of further study of the principles of the politicians of the eighteenth century to learn exactly where the responsibility for the colonial revolt rested. Mr. Alvord maintained the hypothesis that the factions of the George Grenville and of the Duke of Bedford, desiring vindication for the repeal of the stamp tax, were the leaders in the ministry and the Parliament that caused the American Revolution.

In the latter part of his paper Mr. Alvord gave a brief summary of the latest interpretation of the active forces in the Colonies. He pointed out the superficial results obtained by studying exclusively the contemporary controversial literature for the causes of a revolt which was due to the financial depression succeeding the French and Indian War, to the development of a non-English people in the Colonies, and to the propaganda which was at first put forth for purely political purposes but which later developed into a conscious effort to gain independence.

*Discussion.*—Prof. ANDREW C. McLAUGHLIN, of the University of Chicago, pointed out that, from the point of view of constitutional history, too much emphasis, relatively, was still given to the causes of the war. The result of that emphasis is to leave the impression that the Revolutionary period was primarily destructive rather than constructive. While, naturally, it is perfectly proper to seek to discover the causes of the controversy, it is a mistake to suppose that the revolutionary forces were all directed to breaking up the British Empire; the principles of government, whether they were announced because of economic discontent or not, were carried on and actualized in American institutions of government. That was the Revolution—the transformation of colonies into States, the firm institutionalizing of political theories, and finally the solution of the problem of imperial order by the establishment of the Federal Constitution. From the viewpoint of the constitutional history of America, the war was an episode in the development and the crystallizing of institutions. To account for the war on the basis of economic unrest is all well enough; but to account for the United States that emerged during and

after the war is certainly quite as important, and our constitutional history has been misread or obscured by treating it as if it began over again in 1783. The Revolutionary period—if we must have periods—began about 1754 and ended with the adoption of the Federal Constitution.

Prof. ARTHUR MEIER SCHLESINGER, of the Iowa State University, spoke, in effect, as follows:

In his diagnosis of American conditions Professor Alvord names three main causes of the colonial revolt—economic unrest, the American people, and propaganda. It is my own conviction that the stool should have four legs rather than three. I believe with Professor Van Tyne that the religious influence was a considerable force making for disaffection and conflict between the Colonies and the mother country. John Adams has been quoted on this point time and again by writers following in the footsteps of G. E. Ellis and A. L. Cross; but even more convincing is the opinion of Tories like Joseph Galloway and Judge Thomas Jones, who regarded the terms Congregationalist and Presbyterian as virtually synonymous with rebel and disloyalist.

In this company it is appropriate to make a plea for the employment of a more exact terminology in dealing with the revolutionary period. In 1859 Henry B. Dawson, a pioneer in our field, called attention to the difference between "the war of the American Revolution" and "the revolution itself, which preceded and produced that war."<sup>1</sup> A generation before the veteran John Adams had insisted again and again upon the same distinction. "A history of the first war of the United States," he declared, "is a very different thing from a history of the American Revolution." The latter was effected before the war commenced. The Revolution was in the minds and hearts of the people.<sup>2</sup> Anticipating Adams by many years, Dr. Benjamin Rush had cautioned his countrymen in 1787 that "there is nothing more common than to confound the terms of *American Revolution* with those of *the late American war*."<sup>3</sup> Yet the glamor of the military conflict had led historians almost invariably to misapply the terms and to employ them in an unscientific sense. How far this tendency has gone may be seen by recalling the titles of the volumes by Howard and Van Tyne in *The American Nation* series.

After all that has been written on the subject we have not yet an adequate understanding of the popular party of the period—the party which in 1764, on the issue of colonial home rule, embraced virtually all the thinking people of the colonies, but which a decade later had dwindled to a minority of the population on the issue of armed revolt. There are two vital approaches to an understanding of the popular party: (1) A study of the complex framework of the party, and (2) an analysis of the methods of agitation and publicity used by the party.

Looking first at the machinery of the popular party, it is evident that no systematic or cohesive scheme was worked out until the eve of the war. Nevertheless, from the outset the forces of colonial disaffection extemporized suitable organs for action and self-expression. Some of these forms of organization have been completely ignored by the historians, and only a few of them have been studied in satisfactory detail. Yet we are all agreed to-day, I think, that the success of the American Revolution in all its stages rested upon the superiority in organization which the radical minority had achieved. What we need

<sup>1</sup>The Sons of Liberty in New York, p. 7.

<sup>2</sup>Adams came back to this matter again and again. See his Works (Boston, 1850–1856), vol. v, 492; vol. x, 180, 182, 197, 282–283.

<sup>3</sup>Address to the people of the United States in Ezekiah Niles' Principles and Acts of the American Revolution, p. 402.

is an intensive study of the various agencies of opposition and of the relations of these agencies to each other and to the revolutionary movement.

And it is a matter of essential importance to understand the means that were employed to stir the emotions of the populace and to arouse an energetic minority to the point of armed revolt. "The Revolution was in the minds and hearts of the people," John Adams reminds us. The easy generalizations of the earlier historians are of no help to us. What we need is an analysis of the methods of propaganda from the standpoint of the social psychologist. The result of such a study should be an exposition of the technique of revolution as worked out by the trial-and-error process in early times under primitive American conditions.

In conclusion, I believe that a careful study should be made of the part played by holy days and anniversary celebrations in promoting colonial disaffection. When the radicals wished to focus public attention upon some measure they had in view they were likely to prepare the minds of the people by announcing a day of "prayer and humiliation." Closely akin to this practice was the one of commemorating the anniversaries of such events as the repeal of the stamp act and the occurrence of the Boston massacre.

Dr. SAMUEL EL. MORISON, of Harvard University, made a plea for a study of State history during the period of the War for Independence. Thirty-five years ago Doctor Jameson had pointed out that "the most neglected field in American history is the field of State history,"<sup>4</sup> and these words still held good for the period 1775-1788. Of the many existing State histories only two or three—Professor Eckenrode's *Revolution in Virginia* being a notable example—gave adequate treatment of the social and economic conditions, the local politics and constitution making, the class and sectional struggles, the privateering and profiteering, that went on within the "old thirteen" during the war. Doctor Morison recalled how much new light had been thrown on the French Revolution by recent studies in local and regional history. In so decentralized a country as was the United States during its first war no adequate conception of the scope and meaning of the revolutionary movement is possible without intense cultivation of local fields. Doctor Morison announced that for his part he was investigating the revolution in Massachusetts, including Shay's Rebellion, which he considered an integral part of the revolutionary movement in New England, and he hoped that before the managing editor of the *American Historical Review* became as venerable as he is now venerated the younger generation of scholars would provide us with adequate histories of the Revolution in all of the original 13 States.

---

<sup>4</sup>J. Franklin Jameson. *Introduction to the Study of the Constitutional and Political History of the States* (John Hopkins Studies, IV), p. 7. Baltimore, 1886.

## THE FIRST CONSTITUTION OF MISSOURI

(Abstract of paper)

By FREDERICK W. LEHMANN

The Missouri Constitution of 1820, under which the State was admitted into the Union, was a simple instrument, creating a representative democracy, its principal powers being vested in the general assembly, the members of which were chosen by the people. This body was practically under no limitations. It determined in its discretion the modes and objects of legislation. Objects unrelated to each other and of which no notice was given in the title might be combined in the same bill. Private, local, and special laws constitute the burden of the work of nearly every session of the legislature. Bills for personal relief of every kind, granting divorces, establishing lotteries and especially chartering corporations are to be found in abundance. State aid to private enterprise culminated in the fifties in the issuance of bonds to aid in the construction of railroads to the extent of \$24,000,000 imposing a burden of debt upon the State equivalent to \$250,000,000 at the present time. Later, in the sixties, there were issues of bonds by the counties to the extent of about \$8,000,000. These bonds were issued not as a gift but as a loan of the public credit. The State, however, suffered an almost total loss, as did such of the counties as paid their bonds. The State-aided roads were poorly and yet expensively built, while those aided by county subscriptions went little, and in some cases not at all, beyond the paper stage. The present constitution of Missouri, adopted in 1875, was framed by men who had a vivid recollection of the operations of the government under the constitution of 1820, and to prevent a recurrence of the abuses fixed limits to the power of taxation, to the incurring of public debt, to the use of public funds and credit, State or local, for any except strictly public purposes, and prohibited altogether the private, local, and special laws of the old régime. In their judgment, instructed by a hard experience, even in a representative democracy, limitations upon the powers of government were essential to the general welfare.

# TRADITIONS CONCERNING THE MISSOURI QUESTION

(Abstract of paper)

By FLOYD C. SHOEMAKER, Missouri Historical Society

Missouri is the premier State of paradoxes. Settled by the French, who controlled her greatest business, the fur trade, Missouri after 1804 never had an important elective office filled by a Frenchman. A western State not immune from speculation, Missouri never chartered a wildcat bank or issued wildcat currency. A Democratic State shouting both brands—the Jeffersonian and the Jacksonian—Missouri elected two Whig United States Senators and thrice elected by general ticket a Whig Congressman. A Democratic State for 40 years, Missouri followed this with 10 years of Republican rule. A slave Territory and a slave State, Missouri emancipated her own slaves three weeks before Congress proposed the Thirteenth Amendment and eleven months before that amendment was adopted. With 115,000 slaves in 1860, the majority of Missouri's leading slave counties opposed secession and stood for the Union. To-day these counties are the citadel of the Democratic Party in Missouri. On the other hand, the strongest element of voting power of the Missouri secessionists came from many of those counties which to-day are the country backbone of the Republican Party. A Democratic State for nearly three-quarters of a century, Missouri to-day is uniquely independent in politics. The senatorial political prize has never gone begging in Missouri, still Missouri for two years (1855–1857) was represented in the United States Senate by only one man—Henry S. Geyer—the first instance of its kind in American history. A greater paradox is the refusal of Missouri's governor, Sterling Price, to appoint a Senator when the legislature failed to agree. The principle of this refusal, based on strict interpretation of powers, was later given official declaration by the United States Senate. Known most widely to-day for her Pershing, Crowder, and "I'm from Missouri, you've got to show me." For 30 years followed the greatest statesman of the West, then defeated him for his pro-Union principles and 10 years later in State convention declared for peace, conservatism, and unionism. Honored with titles and monuments the man on whom the mantle of Benton fell—the great Frank P. Blair—a Democrat first, then a fighting Republican, and last a fighting Democrat, without fear or reproach, whose name is preserved in G. A. R. posts and in the christening name of the sons of Missouri's Confederates. Missouri truly is a State of paradoxes in which traditions find fertile soil and flourish profusely.

And if ever a State needed the most searching, painstaking scholars to unravel her web of history, that State is Missouri.

There are legends and widespread traditions that call for correction. The author of the Missouri Compromise of 1820 was *not* Henry Clay but Jesse Burgess Thomas, of Illinois. The real Missouri Compromise, the one of 1821, *was* fathered by Henry Clay. The compromise of 1820 was *not* a northern victory; area is the argument used. The error lies in confusing our later nineteenth century geographical conception of the trans-Mississippi country with the American geographical conception of that country in 1820 and as late as 1850.

For 40 years the term "The Great American Desert" included what is to-day one-half of the world's greatest granary—the Mississippi Valley. In reading the literature of that day descriptive of this section, it seems that the Government reports educated the adult population and the school textbooks educated the growing generation to recognize the fact that America could rival Africa in possessing a Sahara.

Zebulon M. Pike did more through his report of 1810 to the War Office to retard settlement of the trans-Mississippi country than all the Indian tribes of the plains. Pike had done more than explore the sources of the Mississippi and discover the peak which bears his name; he had discovered a desert that equaled the Sahara. In geographies and literature, both in America and in foreign countries, "The Great American Desert" was now to receive unstinted publicity.

The next nation-wide advertisement of this district was again gratuitously written by a Government official, Maj. Stephen H. Long, of the United States Army. In a report to the Secretary of War he described the country between the Mississippi and the Missouri in these words: "Large tracts are often to be met with, exhibiting scarcely a trace of vegetation." Of the mountain region he wrote: "It is a region destined by the barrenness of its soil, the inhospitable character of its climate, and by other physical disadvantages to be the abode of perpetual desolation." In conclusion he says: "From the minute account given in the narrative of the expedition of the bad features of the region, it will be perceived to bear a manifest resemblance to the deserts of Siberia."

As Government documents Pike's and Long's reports were widely circulated and generally accepted. They furnished the data for statesmen, historians, and geographers. The most graphic and damaging picture of the "American desert" came from the pen of America's novelist, Washington Irving, when his "Astoria" appeared in 1836. Such descriptions were repeated in 1852 in Smith's geography where he says that the Nebraska country is "little better than a desert," and that the Dakota and Montana country "resembles Nebraska in soil." Gradually the American desert shrunk.

By 1867 western Kansas remained, and 10 years later only the Bad Lands of Dakota were left. "The Great American Desert" of Pike and Long which was in the minds of the statesmen of 1820 had disappeared.

Another tradition rising from the Missouri question relates to the significant strength of the antislavery or slavery restriction sentiment in Missouri. The only reliable measure of such sentiment is the campaign and election of the delegates to Missouri's constitutional convention of 1820. Not a single avowed restrictionist delegate out of 41 was elected. Proslavery sentiment in Missouri in 1820 was overwhelming. Missouri's 10,000 slaves, her 10,000 proslavery French inhabitants, her 40,000 southern settlers gave economic and social bases to proslavery public opinion.

The popular tradition concerning Missouri's first United States Senators that Barton was unanimously elected and that after several days of balloting Benton was then elected, is incorrect. The records of the Missouri Senate show that Barton was not unanimously elected, and that both he and Benton were elected on the same day and on the same ballot.

Missouri's first constitution instead of costing only \$26.25, an example of pioneer economy, actually cost about \$8,800. Missouri's first volume of session acts cost three times as much. Missouri's struggle for statehood and her de facto statehood prior to admission are, contrary to popular belief, unique only in duration of time.

There is no evidence to support the legend that the Missouri Compromise was in any way related to the so-called Texas conspiracy of the slavocracy. The last tradition of the Missouri Question indicts Congress for error and the Missouri Legislature for blindness concerning the Compromise of 1821. But Congress had been accurate, and the "blindness" of the legislature was really keen-sighted policy.

Is Missouri alone the State of paradoxes and traditions? Or is she like all of the West, the victim of misinterpretation, the hoax of "A Great American Desert" myth, the joke of an outlaw and banditry tradition, and the sacrifice of her own all too late appreciation of the permanent value of sound historical studies? I advance the proposition that those States stand highest in general renown which have stood highest in popularizing their true history. Such States may have blots on their Commonwealth escutcheons, but these blots assume grayish tints in the halo of widespread historical appreciation. Other States may have produced an advanced civilization and a galaxy of truly eminent men but without a popular appreciation of history based on scholarly research these States rely on tradition, which, seeking always the spectacular, heralds only the striking, whether it be helpful or harmful, important, or insignificant.

# A SIDELIGHT ON THE REPEAL OF THE MISSOURI COMPROMISE<sup>1</sup>

(Abstract of paper)

By H. BARRETT LEARNED

This investigation based upon contemporary newspapers and the papers of the late Philip Phillips (1807-1884)—papers now deposited in the manuscript division of the Library of Congress—was designed to show that Mr. Phillips's careful formulation of an amendment of the Nebraska bill about January 19, 1854, probably influenced the ultimate form of that bill signed by President Pierce May 30, 1854.

The so-called Kansas-Nebraska act involved the repeal of the Missouri compromise. This repeal was especially sought by the leaders of the Democratic Party, chiefly those from the slave-holding South. It was forced through the Thirty-third Congress by conspicuously shrewd methods and against much opposition on the part of the North. The period during which the measure ran the gravest risks of defeat was between January 4 and February 7. Dixon's proposed amendment of January 16—a clearcut effort to repeal the Missouri compromise—is well known. About that time or a few days later Philip Phillips drafted an amendment similar in design. The Phillips' amendment has never hitherto been printed; but, drafted as it appears to have been at the request of Senator Stephen A. Douglas, it may have been discussed at the White House conference, held on Sunday, January 22, at which certain leaders and Philip Phillips took counsel with President Pierce on the matter, and probably won Pierce and some of his Cabinet over to their views favoring the repeal. Phillips at the time was serving his single term in the House from the Mobile district of Alabama, and was the only member of the House Committee on Territories known to have been present at the Sunday conference.

It can not be shown that either Dixon's or Phillips's respective amendments went directly into the matured law. Doubtless both of them influenced the formulation of that law. Phillips's exact position and his efforts to contribute to this particular piece of legislation have not been hitherto set forth with any degree of precision. The conclusion of the paper is this: "The result of a historical process, the repeal was accomplished, as everybody knows, in the spring of 1854. Such accomplishments in legislation as the repeal—whatever we may think of them—are rarely brought about without the active efforts and earnest cooperation of many minds."

---

<sup>1</sup> Printed in the Mississippi Valley Historical Review for March, 1922, as The Relation of Philip Phillips to the Repeal of the Missouri Compromise in 1854.

# THE INFLUENCE OF THE MOVEMENTS OF POPULATION ON MISSOURI HISTORY BEFORE THE CIVIL WAR

(Abstract of paper)

By WILLIAM O. LYNCH, Indiana University

In the territorial period, the pioneers who settled in Missouri came almost entirely from Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, and North Carolina. Before 1820, there was nothing to attract people from New England, New York, and Pennsylvania to Missouri, as a vast unpeopled area lay between their settled portions and the Mississippi. Great numbers of colonists migrated from Virginia, North Carolina, and Kentucky to Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, as well as to the Territory of Missouri. A fundamental difference was that a sufficient number of slaveholders migrated to Missouri to dominate the situation. According to the census of 1820, the number of slaves was equal to more than one-sixth of the number of free persons. The slaveholders were not in a majority, but there was slight opposition to slavery among the territorial population. If left to decide for herself, Missouri was sure to become a slave-holding State.

This was a fact of great importance in connection with the great struggle that took place in Congress over the admission of Missouri. It was assumed by both restrictionists and antirestrictionists that the people of Missouri would make a proslavery constitution. The compromise which resulted from the congressional controversy, in so far as it concerned the people of Missouri, was a recognition of the principle of "popular sovereignty," while the prohibition of slavery in the vacant part of Louisiana Territory lying north of 36° 30' was an application of the principle of the Wilmot proviso. Thus, long before these rival principles were named and so widely defended and attacked, they were accepted and applied.

Between 1820 and 1850 a gradual change came in the character of the colonists who flowed into Missouri. More and more the southern stream was paralleled by northern and foreign elements. The greatest change came in the decade before the war. From 1850 to 1860, a larger number of foreigners and northerners poured into the State than ever before, while southerners continued to arrive, the tides from Kentucky and Tennessee being especially large.

The most strenuous stage in the peopling of Missouri came while the struggle for Kansas was on. An element of the people of Missouri had a tremendous interest in the outcome of that struggle, and hoped to win Kansas for slavery. In 1860, there were living in that Territory 11,356 persons who had been born in Missouri, which seems

an insignificant number when compared to the 300,000 or more people who came from the outside to find homes in Missouri in the same period. The truth is that Missouri was too immature, before 1860, to send forth many colonists to people any new frontier area, no matter how intense might be her interest in its colonization.

In the period of the Kansas struggle, there was a tremendous migration to frontier areas, but in spite of the great agitation over the settlement of the slavery question in Kansas, the great mass of those who moved westward, both in the North and in the South, sought locations in competing areas, ignoring the impassioned appeal of those who urged them to go to Kansas. A great mass of people from both sections, who could have gone on to Kansas had they cared as much about the issue at stake there as they cared about finding homes and opportunities, were received by Missouri. Between 1850 and 1860, Tennessee contributed to Missouri eleven times the number of people that she furnished to Kansas; Kentucky, five times the number; Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, twice the number; Pennsylvania and New York, a number, in each case, 50 per cent greater; and most startling of all, even the New England States contributed more persons, in this decade, to Missouri, a slave-holding State, than they furnished to save Kansas to freedom.

In the election of 1860, the vote for Lincoln in Missouri was 17,208, about two-thirds of his total vote in the slave-holding States. His greatest strength was in St. Louis. The vote for Bell and Douglas was about exactly even in the State as a whole. The strength of Bell was in the counties where the Whig party had always been strong. In general, his strength lay in the important slave-holding counties. The strength of Breckinridge was greatest in the southern interior counties, and not in the important slave-holding counties. One can not escape the conclusion that the mass of the voters who supported Bell, Breckinridge, and Douglas were controlled by established party ties rather than by the declarations of party platforms. The chief concern of great numbers of Democrats must have been to determine who should be regarded as the true candidate of the party to which they belonged. The election of 1860 was no very real test of the attachment of the voters of Missouri to the Union. Severer tests soon came. Not one of the 99 delegates elected to the convention of 1861 to determine for or against secession was an out-and-out secessionist, though the majority were not "unconditional" Union men. This reveals the situation at that time. The most significant fact is that, whereas Missouri ranked seventh in population among the Union States, she also ranked seventh in the number of soldiers furnished to the Union Armies. This shows what final decision the mass of Missouri's people made when at last they were put to the "acid test."

# THE EMERGENCE OF THE PROBLEMS OF THE PERIOD OUT OF WAR AND RECONSTRUCTION

(Abstract of paper)

By PAUL L. HAWORTH

The Civil War was no mean conflict, measured even by the standards of to-day. From a purely American point of view it was far greater than the one through which we have just passed, and our problems of reconstruction are really easy compared with those that faced our fathers after the surrender of Lee.

Two problems that seemed very difficult at the time, namely, the questions of what should be the status of ex-Confederates and of the seceded States, proved comparatively simple. The Negro was a more serious matter, and even to-day he is still in some respects our greatest problem, and unfortunately, unlike a problem in mathematics, he is incapable of any definite and immediate solution. Emphasis is laid upon the fact that the freedman was left economically dependent upon his former master; in consequence the problem of obtaining labor has never been so acute as in British Guiana and certain West India islands where the emancipated blacks easily obtained land. One result of emancipation was to make the South "solid" politically, and in the 44 years from 1876 to 1920 not a single one of the former Confederate States cast its electoral votes for a Republican candidate.

The Civil War left in its train many serious financial problems. The national debt amounted to almost three billions, and its funding, the meeting of interest, and the finding of means for its gradual extinction exercised the ingenuity of a long line of financiers. Tariff duties were raised to heights hitherto undreamed, and the question of reducing them became, after the reconstruction period, the most persistent in our politics. Hundreds of millions in paper money were issued during the conflict, and behind these "greenbacks" there was nothing but the fiat of the Government. With the return of peace there began a conflict between inflationists and contractionists that was to last a generation. "More greenbacks" was at first the slogan of the inflationists, but in time they began to transfer their affections from green paper to white metal, and "free silver" finally became their cry. Most of the reputable historians of the period have not sufficiently recognized the fact that the contraction policy of the Government worked a great hardship upon debtors and proved greatly to the advantage of creditors.

Americans were long mainly an agricultural people, but the Nation was now making great strides toward a new order of things. As the land filled with inhabitants, as new industries sprang up, the Nation drifted away from the simplicity of an agricultural age and its problems grew more complex. The Civil War greatly accelerated this movement toward an industrial age, and, following it, the United States experienced an industrial development unequalled in some respects in all history. During the war there was not only vastly more manufacturing than ever before, but there was a distinct tendency toward the consolidation of industries. The day of the corporation was dawning, and it was not long before single corporations began to seek to control whole industries. By 1877 the Standard Oil Co., for instance, controlled fully nine-tenths of all the oil refined in the United States, and five years later it was transformed into the Standard Oil Trust, an example that was widely imitated by financiers in other forms of industry.

So far as a definite date can be given, the withdrawal by President Hayes, in 1877, of the Federal troops from the support of the carpetbag governments in Louisiana and South Carolina may be said to mark the end of an era. The Civil War issues were dead or dying. The presence in the United States of millions of negroes continued, it is true, to be a serious fact, but rather as a problem than as a genuine political issue. Political orators continued to sway many voters by appeals to sectional prejudices, but the real issues were rapidly becoming economic and social. Civil service reform, the tariff, the currency, the warfare of labor and capital, trusts, transportation—these were some of the real questions of the coming decades. Great industries were developing with incredible swiftness, population was moving into urban centers, the simplicity of an agricultural age was passing. A gulf had opened between capital and labor, and consolidation was becoming the order of the day, both in the labor world and the industrial world. New maladies called for new remedies, but the tendencies of the time were little understood and there was much dim groping after panaceas.

## LIGHT ON THE PERIOD FROM THE GARFIELD PAPERS

(Abstract of paper)

By THEODORE C. SMITH, Williams College

The value of personal correspondence in connection with recent political history is less than it is for history previous to the age of newspapers, but it still may serve to illuminate motives and to reveal personal dealings among public men. The papers of James Abram Garfield possess this value in special degree regarding the subjects under discussion, owing to the fact that Garfield, during his entire congressional career devoted his chief attention to problems of finance. What keeps them from having the highest value is Garfield's abstention from the reconstruction controversies, his aversion to deals and political intrigues, and still more the fact that his views on the tariff and currency were those of a minority in Congress. His advocacy of specie resumption and of tariff reduction twice prevented him, in 1867 and 1871, from attaining the goal of his congressional ambition—the chairmanship of the Committee of Ways and Means. After 1875 the Democratic Party controlled the House, and Garfield soon found himself playing the part of the floor leader of the Republican minority, and, thus, rapidly advancing to a position of greater party prominence than he had hitherto attained. He acted as the mouthpiece of President Hayes, took an active part in the political maneuvers of 1876-77 regarding the disputed election, fought the battle against the Democratic riders in 1877-1880 and took the lead in opposing inflationist legislation. This made his position much more favorable for securing "inside information" during the last years of his congressional course. The Garfield papers, now housed at Mentor, comprise full files of letters both from and to General Garfield, as well as abundant other biographical material. Perhaps the most important document is a rather full journal running from 1872 to 1881. These papers form a mine of information concerning congressional and party history from 1863 to 1880 and contain a quantity of wholly untouched evidence bearing on Garfield's nomination, election, administration, and the tragedy which ended his life.

# THE USE OF THE NEWSPAPER AND PERIODICAL SOURCES

(Abstract of paper)

By ARTHUR C. COLE, Ohio State University

Journalistic sources have long since been assigned a definite place among those records of the past utilized by historians. There appears no sound reason for challenging this situation. Further, there is no sound basis for an assumption that a special critique is necessary for such sources. The critical problems in using newspaper material are not different in kind from those that develop in the use of other records. There is more anonymous authorship, in the sense of the lack of proper names, but other facts that surround the question of authorship become available under a proper application of the principles of historical criticism. In the ephemeral unimportance of much of the news, journalistic sources can be compared with large unselected manuscript collections; unlike other printed sources, there has been no editorial intervention in the interest of historical usage. Further, no short cuts through the vast masses of data have been developed, nor is the outlook on this point promising.

These problems bulk so large that there is seldom an adequately critical use made of these materials. In view of this situation the historical profession needs badly a series of intensive studies of various phases and various examples of recent American journalism. The inner recesses of newspaperdom should be penetrated, by drawing not only upon the press, and upon published sources, but upon data drawn from members and ex-members of the journalistic guild through the medium of the questionnaire. Such studies would serve as invaluable aids in the practice of the principles of criticism as well as in the processes of historical synthesis, particularly in the use of the argument from silence. They would tend to clarify the use of the contemporary press as a key to that elusive problem of determining the currents of public opinion. Newspaper sources, in reflecting the length and breadth of human activities and interests, have contributed to the breakdown of the more narrow interpretations of history and have rendered important service to the general historian in determining the full scope of his narrative. The time has arrived when an adequate direct use of these sources by the general historian is humanly impossible. These data, however, could be placed at his disposal through the proposed monographic studies of recent journalistic developments. Here is a unique opportunity for the younger members of the historical guild.

## THE FIELD OF RELIGIOUS DEVELOPMENT

(Abstract of paper)

By FRANCIS A. CHRISTIE, Meadville Theological Seminary

The conspicuous movement was the national organization of loosely related churches with efforts toward interdenominational union for civic and national welfare, the emphasis being shifted from divisive doctrinal to ethical and philanthropic interests. These tendencies were prepared for in the concerted efforts of the Christian Commission and the Sanitary Commission of the Civil War. The movement found expression in the Conference of the Evangelical Alliance which helped to emphasize both the interest of church unity and social reforms. The discussions and experiments leading to the notable result of the Federal Union of the Churches of Christ present a field for investigation. Obvious factors were the interdenominational lay societies in which young people learned to cooperate with a subordination of sectarian feeling. Another factor was the development in the theological schools of a scientific method for dealing with the data of religion. The commonly adopted method resulted in growing agreement as to religious facts, and their interpretation, and the training of a new generation of clergy by theologians whose constructions were independent of denominational groupings. Awaiting full and dispassionate treatment, are the progress of social, reformatory efforts, the marked adaptation of Catholic churchmanship to the principles of American political life, and the vogue of a new conception of Divine grace in the circle of Christian Science and New Thought.

# FIELDS FOR RESEARCH IN THE SOUTH AFTER RECONSTRUCTION

(Abstract of paper)

By ELLA LONN, Goucher College

The history of the South during the period immediately following Reconstruction is a field which has so far been little cultivated by historians. The years from about 1875 to 1890, which for purposes of convenience and unity might be designated as "The beginning of recovery and of the New South," have not been marked by the dramatic incidents which arrest attention during the earlier period, but the story of the slow, steady task of upbuilding, of recreating, of recovering, is even more inspiring to the student who looks beneath the surface.

The first requirement for a better understanding of the period than is yet ours, is a series of monographs on the political development in each State to complete the work begun by C. C. Pearson, for Virginia, and by R. P. Brooks, for Georgia. The work of examining the relation of the geography to the history still remains to be done for the various States of the South, except in the case of Virginia and of Missouri, and has a peculiar significance for this period of economic development. The economic field has been more adequately covered than any other in such works as that of P. A. Bruce, "The Rise of the New South," and that of J. C. Ballagh, "The Economic History, 1865-1909" (The South in the Building of the Nation). But these works sweep over the entire period since the Civil War so that much still remains to be done in investigating the discovery of the natural resources, the first beginnings of manufactures, and the emergence of a labor problem. Particularly interesting is the question of the share of the North in that upbuilding, in leadership and in capital. The furthering of inland water transportation by State and Nation and the changed status of southern ports are tasks which still await the investigator.

Much has been written on the social phases, but even that covers a wide field and barely scratches the surface, for a multitude of questions obtrude themselves, the answers to which have yet to be worked out. We do not know fully the facts concerning the care of defectives during this difficult time, the various penal systems, the beginning of protective legislation, or how the South took care of her maimed soldiers or their dependents. The movement of population, interstate and intrastate, North and South, particularly the

negro exodus and the efforts of the South for immigrants, will afford a better basis for the appreciation of other social questions. In passing, one may note that the negro question is far from exhausted. The value of negro conventions, the history of the prohibition movement, and negro relief schemes are a few of the attractive subjects which suggest themselves.

A study of the agricultural conditions would reap a rich harvest, for the period marks the beginning of State departments of agriculture, of acknowledgment of and consequent reduction of waste, of change in farm methods, and the promotion of agricultural colleges. There was much talk of the "wild" and waste lands at this time, though adequate treatment would necessitate consideration for a longer period than 15 years.

Before the authoritative work on education in the South can be written, much intensive study of the program and progress in each State will need to be made. The growth of normal schools and the work of mission schools and church colleges are a part of the story.

For the person who can become enthusiastic over questions of finance, the period offers special opportunities for the study of the revenue systems in each State, except of Kentucky where the work has already been done, and of the attitude of the South on the various tariff issues. The legalistic and constitutional fields present a wide list of unsolved problems, ranging from amendments to the State constitutions to the freedom of the southern bench from politics.

A series of monographs on the leaders of the period would shed light on many phases of the development, especially if made to include not only the political characters, such as Wade Hampton, L. Q. C. Lamar, Mahone, and Gorman, but also the business men and journalists to whom much credit is due for the New South, such as H. W. Grady and William Carter Stubbs.

Religious history has been so largely neglected by the trained historian that the particular aspects which concern our period, though of real significance, must probably await a more fundamental study of the religious life, sect by sect. Local history, municipal and county, offers alluring subjects from the township movement in North Carolina to such a phoenix-like rebirth as that of Atlanta. Lastly, the spiritual side may be attempted by the bolder and more venturesome scholar, for the effort to trace the changes in conservatism, the growth of tolerance, the change in character, and the slow efforts at cementing the breach between the North and South call for the scholar, with infinite patience to unravel them, and the skill, judgment, and acumen to set them forth.

*Discussion.*—Because of the lateness of the hour, Mr. CHAS. W. RAMSDELL, of the University of Texas, who led the discussion, confined himself to indi-

cating two subjects in southern history which merit investigation. One is the economic penetration and exploitation of the South by northern capital after the Civil War as a result of the great accumulation of capital in the North and the general prostration of all industry in the South during that conflict. Such an investigation would probably have to be undertaken through a series of monographic studies of individual industries or enterprises in the South, as railroads, factories, commercial houses, and agricultural communities, and perhaps of northern banking houses or other creditor institutions. Another subject which offers many points of attack is the agricultural revolution, so well done for Georgia, on the economic side, by Dr. R. P. Brooks, and the social and political revolutions which accompanied or followed upon the agricultural. A series of monographic studies, one for each State, would not only add much to our knowledge of the consequences of the Civil War, but might help to explain some of the strange and disquieting political flare-ups in certain of the Southern States during more recent years.

Prof. LOUIS PELZER, of the State University of Iowa, spoke briefly. No abstract of his remarks has been furnished.

---

#### GROWTH OF INDUSTRIES IN LOUISIANA, 1699-1763

Mrs. N. M. MILLER SURREY, who, on behalf of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, is compiling the Calendar of Manuscripts in Paris Archives Relating to the Mississippi Valley, drew from her great repository of notes the materials for a paper on the growth of industries in Louisiana, 1699-1763, full of new and detailed information, especially on the development of agricultural industries in that colony during the French period.

# THE FUR TRADE AND THE NORTHWEST BOUNDARY, 1783-1814

(Abstract of paper)

By CARDINAL GOODWIN, Mills College

According to the terms of the treaty of Paris, September 3, 1783, the northwestern boundary of the United States was to be formed by a line running "Through Lake Superior northward of the Isles Royal and Phelipeaux, to the Long Lake, thence through the middle of said Long Lake, and the water communication between it and the Lake of the Woods, to the said Lake of the Woods; thence through the said lake to the most northwestern part thereof, and from thence on a due west course to the river Mississippi; \* \* \*."

In his letter to Lord Grenville dated February 2, 1792, George Hammond, the English minister to the United States, called attention to the clause in the treaty of 1783 which provided for a western line connecting the Lake of the Woods with the Mississippi. "This line," he wrote, "is unquestionably ideal in every sense of the word; for from the best information I can obtain in this country, as well as from the very accurate map which I have received from Montreal, it is evident that a line, however extended in this direction, would never strike the Mississippi, of which river the source is (and I believe correctly) stated to be within American territory. I trust that this government will not endeavor to take advantage of this accidental geographical error, which, if not rectified, will not only leave the limits between the two countries undefined, but also render entirely nugatory the eighth article of the treaty which stipulates that the navigation of the Mississippi from its source to the ocean is to remain free and open to the subjects of the two countries, respectively. It will, however, be extremely important for me to receive your Lordship's instructions as to the manner in which I am to treat this point, whenever negotiations may be sufficiently advanced to admit of its being discussed."<sup>1</sup>

During these years the British fur traders were living in constant fear of the Americans.<sup>2</sup> When they learned that the source of the Mississippi probably lay south of the Lake of the Woods they were apparently more distressed than ever. This affords an explanation of the recommendation made by Hammond in 1792—namely,

---

<sup>1</sup> Historical Manuscript Commission, Fourteenth Report, Appendix, Part V, 254.

<sup>2</sup> McLaughlin, "The Western Posts and the British Debts" in the Annual Report of the American Historical Association (1894).

that an Indian buffer State be formed to include all the territory northwest of the Ohio. Of course, the proposal was rejected by the United States.

When Washington appointed Jay envoy extraordinary to England in the spring of 1794, members of the Northwest Co. had already submitted to an agent of the American Government and to the British ministry a memorandum which discussed the stipulations it would be necessary to conclude with the United States in order to make it possible for the British fur traders to withdraw their property from the American side of the boundary line in the case the northwestern posts were given up. At the same time the question of admitting American fur traders into Canada came up for consideration. The British fur traders informed their Government that this might be permitted. Such an arrangement would not prove in the least injurious to them, because the expense of transport from the United States to the Indian country was nearly double what it cost by way of the St. Lawrence. This, with the heavy imposts placed upon European articles by the United States, gave such a decided advantage to the British that serious competition would be eliminated.<sup>3</sup>

At the same time Isaac Todd and Simon McTavish, the agents of the North West Company who had submitted the memoir, pointed out that most of the posts where the traders spent the winter were within the territory claimed by the United States, and that several of the posts on the Mississippi were on the Spanish side of the river. Since the lands on which posts were located belonged to the Indians, the country ought, in justice to them, to be declared neutral ground, open to both British and American subjects, with satisfactory assurance of protection for the Indians and the traders. Then, too, Grand Portage, on Lake Superior, which was essential to British trade, was situated on the American side of the boundary line. If the British were to maintain their interest in the fur trade in this quarter, this route must be kept open to them.

On August 30 of that year Grenville suggested to Jay that the northwest boundary established by the treaty of 1783 be modified to an extent that would have given the North West Co. the Grand Portage, but this proposal Jay rejected. In the second article of the treaty concluded between the United States and Great Britain in November, 1794, provision was made for surrendering the northwest posts on or before June 1, 1796.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Chatham MS., Vol. 346—Canada in the British Record Office. Transcripts of some of the documents used in this paper are given in the appendices of Gordon Charles Davidson, "The North West Company," University of California Publications in History, 1918.

<sup>4</sup> American State Papers, Foreign Relations, I, 500.

On October 6, 1802, Gore wrote to the Secretary of State that Lord Hawkesbury thought the intention of the treaty of peace was to give both nations access to the Mississippi through their own territories. In accordance with this idea the British Foreign Secretary submitted a treaty, the fifth article of which proposed to substitute a line which would follow the most direct route from the northwest corner of the Lake of the Woods to the nearest source of the Mississippi River.<sup>5</sup> A treaty containing such a line was drawn up and signed by the agents of the United States and of Great Britain on May 12, 1803, and was forwarded to the Senate of the United States on December 24 following. This line would undoubtedly have been accepted had it not been for the purchase of Louisiana by the United States. The treaty of cession was dated April 30, 1803, approximately two weeks earlier than the date on which the agents of the United States and Great Britain had signed the treaty fixing the northwestern boundary. Members of the Senate were persuaded that the fifth article, if accepted, would restrict the northern boundary of the territory acquired from France.

Meanwhile Lord Harrowby replaced Lord Hawkesbury in the British foreign office, and the treaty which had been ratified by the Senate of the United States, with the fifth article omitted, came into the hands of the new secretary. That official manifested displeasure with the Americans for the omission, and conducted himself in such a way as to persuade Monroe to think his Lordship wanted Great Britain to profit as a result of the purchase of Louisiana by the United States.

On September 5, 1804, Monroe delivered to Harrowby a paper on the boundary question in which he attempted to justify the claims of the United States to territory in the Northwest.<sup>6</sup>

Apparently Lord Harrowby was not particularly impressed with Monroe's presentation of the boundary question. Over a year later, October 18, 1805, the American representative wrote Madison that the British had said nothing about the boundary recently.

In May, 1806, Pinckney was commissioned to join the American minister, James Monroe, in England, the two to be ministers extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the English Government to consider "the maritime wrongs" which had been committed, and the regulation of commerce and navigation. A treaty was drawn up in the spring of the following year and, contrary to instructions, contained an article on the northwest boundary.

While this treaty was not submitted to the Senate of the United States for consideration, the proposal is of interest because of its close resemblance to the line finally accepted by both nations in the treaty of 1818.

---

<sup>5</sup> American State Papers, Foreign Relations, II, 582-583.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, III, 97.

A memorial from McTavish, Fraser & Co. and English Ellis & Co., signed June 30, 1812, was sent to the "Lords of the Committee of His Majesty's Most Honorable Privy Council," in which the signers urgently renewed their petition for a charter. If their request were ignored or denied they warned the Government officials that the northwest fur trade would be lost to the British.<sup>7</sup>

Approximately two years later, May, 1814, the month before the British commissioners left for Ghent, another memorial was sent by the Northwest Co. at the desire of Earl Bathurst, urging a modification of the boundary of the United States. The memorialists renewed their charges against the United States Government. Since the purchase of Louisiana, the American Government had been diligent in passing "vexatious regulations" and annoying revenue laws for the express purpose of breaking up the British trade among the Indians of the Northwest. "Unfortunately the measures have been too successful and the trade has in consequence gradually declined since the year 1803 'till in the year preceding the present war, the enormous losses inflicted on the Michillimackinac Co. caused the dissolution of that concern and with it the complete abandonment of the Indian trade to the south of Lake Superior."

This had been a severe blow to the Indians in that section who had learned to depend upon the British for their trade, and who suspected the American Government of attempting "to destroy their independence." As a result they had entered the war against the United States, and the defense of Upper Canada in the early period of the war was due largely to the efforts of the Indian allies.

The memorialists then outlined four possible boundaries which they suggested the British commissioners submit to the American representatives. These were accompanied by a map illustrating the boundaries proposed.<sup>8</sup>

The adoption of any one of these boundaries would have secured the British fur traders possession of the country drained by the Great Lakes and by the upper courses of the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers.

The influence of these recommendations may be traced from the beginning of the conferences between the American and British commissioners in 1814. The latter, according to the Americans, introduced the subject "indistinctly \* \* \* when first proposed," and their explanations were "at first obscure, and always given with reluctance; and it was declared from the first moment to be a *sine qua non*, rendering any discussion unprofitable until it was admitted as a basis."<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> Liverpool Papers. Vol. LXVIII in the British museum. Also in the British Record Office, F. O. 5-103.

<sup>8</sup> British Record Office, F. O. 5-103.

<sup>9</sup> American State Papers, Foreign Relations, III, 707.

To the British representatives the Americans wrote, August 24, 1814, that "to surrender both the rights of sovereignty and of soil over nearly one-third of the territorial domains of the United States to a number of Indians, not probably exceeding 20,000, the undersigned are so far from being instructed or authorized that they assure the British plenipotentiaries any arrangements for that purpose would be instantaneously rejected by their Government."

This ended the attempt of the British commissioners to force a settlement on the basis of a readjustment of the boundaries and the establishment of an Indian State in the country north of the Ohio. In new instructions dated September 1 Bathurst admitted that the demand for the formation of an Indian State had been made as a *sine qua non*, but in reality, he said, it was not to be regarded as such. Fifteen days later, September 16, he wrote more instructions directing his commissioners to abandon their demands for Indian territory and exclusive control of the Lakes, and to ask only that the Indians should be included in the peace.

The treaty of Ghent was signed on December 24, 1814. With the conclusion of that treaty must have ended the British fur traders' hope of acquiring a hold on the territory of the Old Northwest. Each passing year strengthened the grasp of the United States on the coveted area and weakened that of Great Britain. As a result, when the convention of 1818 was signed, the adjustment of the northwest boundary and the determination of the northern limits of the Louisiana Territory had been pretty well marked out by the suggestions of earlier diplomats, both English and Americans.

## COMMERCE AND UNION SENTIMENT IN THE OLD NORTHWEST IN 1860

(Abstract of paper)

By A. L. KOHLMEIER, Indiana University

One group of conditions tended to hold the Old Northwest together while another group of conditions tended to cause it to divide somewhere near the national road into a northern and a southern section. Among the latter conditions was the commercial attachment of the northern section to the northeastern part of the United States and the commercial attachment of the southern section to the South and to the East. So that when the secession movement came in the South the people of the Old Northwest found that because of the first group of conditions they could not divide the Northwest, attaching the northern part to a northeastern confederacy and the southern part to the southern confederacy, neither could they, on account of their commercial attachments, remain together and thus join either a northeastern confederacy or a southern confederacy or set up for themselves. It became apparent that for the people of the Old Northwest the only salvation lay in the preservation of the Union. This conflict of conditions was at once the cause of the apparent differences of opinion in the Northwest late in 1860 and at the same time, through its very irreconcilability, the cause of the strong Union sentiment of the overwhelming majority apparent by the middle of 1861.

# CRITICAL PROBLEMS INVOLVED IN THE USE OF THE OFFICIAL RECORDS OF THE WORLD WAR

(Abstract of paper)

By WAYNE E. STEVENS, Dartmouth College

The active interest of historians in the World War and its problems may be said to have entered upon a new phase. When the war clouds first loomed over Europe, the most obvious task which confronted professional historians was to assist in presenting to the public the issues of the great struggle. They continued in this work until the war ended and it must be admitted that their efforts met with a large measure of success. Never before in all history perhaps, have the peoples of any belligerent nations had such definite conceptions of the ends for which they were striving.

From the very beginning, historians were also conscious of a second duty which they must perform and as the war drew to a close they were able to devote more time and energy to its fulfillment. This second task consisted in the preservation of the documents and other materials which will be necessary for studying the history of the war. The work of collecting and insuring the preservation of material has not yet been completed but the heaviest part of the task has been accomplished. Notwithstanding the tremendous flood of literature by which the world has been inundated during the past six or seven years it may be truthfully said that the real problems of the war have scarcely been touched.

In approaching the historical problems of the World War, a brief survey of the literature which has appeared thus far will be of service. There is little question that the most important historical contribution which has been made thus far consists in the memoirs and diaries of those who were participants in the struggle.

It will be the task of the historian in future years to ascertain the facts, upon the basis of which an accurate and impartial account of the events of the war can be written. One can not help feeling that the historian does not appreciate fully the responsibility which rests upon him. Writers of memoirs, as well as the public at large, are depending upon him to settle all controverted questions once and for all, fairly and impartially.

There is a tendency somewhat naively to assume that once historical scholars have been given access to the official records of the World War, the remainder of the task will be simple and that all that will be required will be time and a certain amount of patience. There is

even a tendency among professional historians to underestimate the critical problems involved in handling material of this character. Perhaps the contents of modern archives present less knotty problems than do certain medieval documents, but from the critical standpoint, the difference is merely one of degree. There are very serious critical difficulties involved in the use of modern official documents. In fact the most difficult part of the historian's task confronts him at the moment when the official archives are thrown open to him.

The critical problems which confront the investigator in the use of this material may be conveniently divided into the two classes which are familiar to all students of method, i. e., problems of external and internal criticism. External criticism attempts to determine the authenticity of the document itself while internal criticism attempts to determine its value for historical purposes, once its authenticity has been established.

One who desires to use official records will first of all be confronted by certain serious difficulties arising out of the very mass of the material in existence. The records of the World War are more voluminous than those for any struggle which has preceded it and no one who has not come into actual physical contact with them can possibly appreciate their tremendous bulk. The problem is further complicated by the fact that so much essential material will be found in the archives of nations other than the one whose archives are the basis for study. One characteristic of the war was the tremendous development of international cooperation. The study of any series of events related to the struggle, whether military, economic, or political, will almost inevitably necessitate investigations in foreign archives, in an effort to secure all the essential facts.

Another difficulty which will scarcely be appreciated by one who has not had actual experience consists in the problem of securing accurate and authentic copies of documents.

Official records, and particularly military records, are peculiarly lacking in those human qualities which would be helpful to the student. As has already been stated, the authorship is usually extremely difficult to determine, and it might be that a knowledge of the author and of his particular bias would be of the greatest assistance in interpreting the document. While the personality of the author usually remains hidden, it will be found that documents of this sort are peculiarly subject to human bias and error. In reporting upon conditions within his command, for example, there is every motive for an officer, unconsciously, it is true, to report in such a way as to reflect credit upon himself or to conceal mistakes. The ever-present element of personal responsibility renders military records particularly subject to errors of this sort.



progress is to be made in the historical exploitation of the official records of the World War, the task must first be carefully organized. The field must be surveyed and divided and limits set to the subjects to be investigated. A critical study of the literature of the war, which has already appeared, is extremely desirable in this connection as a preliminary to the use of the archives themselves.

Too much emphasis can not be placed upon the care of the archives containing the records of the World War if the material which they contain is to be available to historical scholars in years to come. It is imperative that the integrity of the archives shall be preserved and their rearrangement or reclassification shall not be attempted by inexperienced persons.

The situation is such that the interests of historical research demand that such organizations as the American Historical Association do all in their power to preserve the integrity of the archives of the United States Government bearing upon the World War. Much valuable assistance can also be rendered through the preparation of guides and bibliographies which will serve as a key to the organizations which produced them and thus render their contents more accessible.

Finally there is a need for further study of the critical problems involved in the use of these records—that is, to problems of technique and method. Official records must be subjected to more careful and critical analysis than has been devoted to them in the past. The result will be to facilitate greatly the intelligent use of this material and to eliminate error in future historical research. As a step preliminary to the approach to the great historical problems of the World War, would it not be possible for a group of competent scholars to devote some time to the task of clarifying those principles of method which must be followed in any research based upon official records?

# THE CONTRIBUTION TO THE HISTORY OF THE WORLD WAR OF A GROUP OF OFFICERS OF THE A. E. F.

(Abstract of paper)

By SHIPLEY THOMAS

Memories that we thought were imperishable, the very details of historic deeds done before our eyes in the war, are gradually fading into the mists of obscurity.

At the time of the armistice the minds of the men who had actually seen the battles were filled with the details of these actions.

Three days after the armistice there assembled one officer from almost every combat unit of the American forces to review the war. No group was better fitted for the task. These men were for the most part regimental intelligence officers, whose duty it had been to know everything that was going on. Each man, therefore, was an eyewitness of the actions of his own unit, and together they had seen every action of American troops on the front. These officers were highly trained and had been selected because of their natural fitness as competent observers. There was, of course, some divisional or local prejudice in their discussion, but it was too soon after the armistice for this to be apparent. It was not until much later that these local jealousies developed and bore full fruit in the publication of the camouflaged unit histories. The one purpose in common of all that group was to find out what actually happened.

General headquarters was near enough so that each afternoon one of the important staff officers, or chiefs of auxiliary arms or services, could be sent to tell of the history of his particular specialty. These lectures, which filled every afternoon for two months, were a recital of everything that happened behind the front.

The lectures and problems of the school played but a secondary part, however, for it was in the informal discussions which took place in the evenings that the real value of the conference developed. Around the big fireplace, eager questions soon evolved a perfect picture of each action, and bit by bit the panorama grew vivid in the minds of those men. There in one room was told the whole history of the A. E. F. No official records were kept, but I was fortunate in keeping notes which I was able to expand immediately after my return into a book, while they were still fresh.

To illustrate the minute details in which the actions were developed, I shall take the liberty of describing the cavalry charge of July 18, 1918. There are no records of this in general headquarters, and it has

consequently been questioned by General Pershing's staff, but, as I saw it myself, I have quoted it as an example. To-day there is a legend that American troops were universally successful in every action. This is due to the great care with which unit histories were written for consumption in this country. American troops met with reverses, as, for example, when General Pershing personally relieved the general commanding the Fifth Division, and again, September 29, 1918, when three divisions out of eight were defeated and in retreat. I have cited these few examples to show the candor and detail with which the history of each battle was related in those evening discussions.

The result was, the development of the actual history, and the lesson learned, that loyalty, courage, and energy come from the top down. This was the contribution these officers made to the history of the war. Their value was the record of these fresh memories which they gave around the brick fireplace at Langres.

# CAUSES OF THE WORLD WAR

(Abstract of paper)

By COL. C. R. HOWLAND, U. S. A.

The causes of the war group themselves into three great classes: The underlying cause; the basic cause; the exciting cause.

The investigation and discovery of the underlying cause proceeds from the fact that there is a community of interest in Europe; that in 1693 William Penn, a great American administrator, proposed a definite plan for a league of European states for the purpose of securing and maintaining European peace, but that instead of attempting that solution the public men of Europe placed their reliance upon the application of the principle of the balance of power and upon the possibility of adjustment by a concert of powers. The test in 1914 showed that a challenger to break the balance of power could prevent a concert of the powers, and that the application of the balance of power is better adapted to securing a decision by war than to prevent a war. Conclusion: The absence of a European government with jurisdiction strictly over European questions was the great underlying cause of the war.

The investigation of the basic cause starts from the premise that as Kaiser Wilhelm II of Germany precipitated the war by declaring war on Russia, the burden of proof rests on him to show that he had the defense of Germany only in mind as his objective. An examination of history shows that some of the Hohenzollern policies before the Napoleonic wars were divine right to rule; war was Prussia's national industry; Prussia must extend her territory; the "Frederician tradition" that, when contrary to her interest, Prussia was not bound by treaties.

After the Napoleonic wars, down to William II, in pursuance of those policies, the Hohenzollerns took Schleswig-Holstein from Denmark in order to dig the strategic Kiel Canal, defeated France in order to unite Germany under the Hohenzollern rule, and took Alsace-Lorraine in order to improve Germany's frontier and her industrial condition.

Then William II crystallized the Hohenzollern policies into a definite plan to overcome the balance of power and secure world control by a war in 1914, and, on a synchronized time schedule, prepared Germany by psychological propaganda for leadership and for the rest of the world to follow Germany, by building a great surface and submarine navy to capture control of the sea, and by organizing the greatest army in the history of the world to secure control of the land and of the air. In the attempt to win as much as possible of his first objective—i. e., "Mittel Europa" in peace, he won

the favor of Turkey to his plan by posing as the protector of Islam, and the favor of all the Balkan states, except Serbia and Montenegro, by placing German princes on the thrones; and he welded "Mittel Europa" together with the Berlin-Bagdad Railroad, but by June 24, 1914, when he opened the Kiel Canal and in all departments was ready for war, Serbia could not be won to the "Mittel Europa" plan and so blocked the Berlin-Bagdad Railroad. Conclusion: The great basic cause of the war was that Kaiser William II had prepared a war of sufficient force to break the balance of power and had it ready to let loose after June 24, 1914, when his program of preparation was completed.

The investigation of the exciting cause of the war shows that the Kaiser's Pan-German plan led through the Balkans to Constantinople; that the Slav race extended from Russia across the Balkans to the Adriatic Sea; that the two conflicting forces met in the region of Serbia; that the Austrian Crown Prince, because of a marriage beneath his imperial station, was hated by the court at Vienna (and his children made ineligible to reign), was hated by the Slavs; and shortly after the Kaiser was ready for war, the Crown Prince, without special police protection, was sent into a Yugo-Slav Province of Austria to inspect troops and there assassinated. Also that the Austrian Emperor took no action for more than three weeks, and then, although the assassination had not occurred in Serbia, held the Servian Government responsible for it in an ultimatum in which Serbia was given only 48 hours in which to reply by either accepting the overlordship of Austria or war. And that the Kaiser William II, claiming that the whole question was local to Austria and Serbia, prevented a concert of powers; that the Czar promised to take no provocative action while the Servian matter was under discussion; that Austria, July 21, agreed to discuss the Servian note with Russia, which under the conditions existing met the requirements for prevention of a war because of Serbia, and then the Kaiser within 12 hours seized the initiative and, disregarding the Austrian mobilization on the Russian frontier, sent a highly provocative ultimatum to Russia requiring her to promise within 12 hours that she would demobilize even on the Austrian frontier. Conclusion: The insulting ultimatum to Russia could have no other purpose than to provoke a European war and was the great exciting cause of the war.

The conclusion of the whole investigation is that the following facts are established: That Europe had not protected herself against an international war of aggression by the organization of a European Government; that the Kaiser, coveting power and dominion, organized a war to overcome the balance of power, and, under the cloak of the Serbian situation, let the war loose on Europe.

# THE THIRTY-FIFTH DIVISION ON SEPTEMBER 29, 1918

(Abstract of paper)

By COL. C. H. LANZA, U. S. A.

The Thirty-fifth Division was not ready for first-line fighting when transferred from its quiet sector in the Vosges Mountains to an important line on the right bank of the Aisne River. A complete misunderstanding of the nature of the attack had caused the staff of the First Army to order a "pursuit offensive," instead of a well-supported advance. The corps, brigade, and division staffs did not have concerted orders and were wholly lacking in communication facilities. And, lastly, the division artillery support which was given was so poorly placed that the infantry was forced to advance without barrage protection.

On the night of September 28, 1918, the Thirty-fifth Division was occupying a sector to the right of Aire River between the Twenty-eighth and Ninety-first Divisions. It had been assigned a front about one mile and a half in length facing two guard divisions of Germans.

The division was spread out in a section of country roughly conforming to a rectangle and about four miles deep. The terrain was extremely disadvantageous for an advance. The front line was thrown forward into a wooded ridge with supporting trenches farther back. Division headquarters was located in about the center of the rectangle, with engineer and machine-gun reserves to one side near the bank of the Aire. Various brigades were located at points behind the front line and the extreme rear lines of the division.

It was drizzling rain, and at that time of year a heavy fog, which seldom lifts until about noon, made visibility very low. Nightfall added to the uncertainty of the ground, and the density of the woods caused messenger communication to be almost impracticable.

The commanding general of the First Army had been informed that the German positions opposing the Thirty-fifth Division were lightly held, and that an advance for about 7 miles was possible if the movement was executed quickly.

General Pershing visited the division on the 28th and was informed that the resistance to an advance would be very much stronger than was anticipated. He accordingly gave verbal instructions for artillery support and outlined to corps and brigade commanders the general plan of advance.

But the staff of the Army did not await further consultation. It ordered the Army artillery not to support the division, as a pursuit attack was to be undertaken and barrage support would slow it up. The Army order was issued at about 11 o'clock on the night of the 28th, setting the hour for the advance as 5.30 o'clock the following morning. In the meantime, however, the Corps Staff had anticipated the general Army order and had issued an order for the attack, instructing the corps artillery to give support. The division staff anticipated the corps order and issued the division order about a half hour before the corps order was received. The division order instructed the division artillery to lay down a barrage, but the commander made a mistake in figuring his coordinates and called for a barrage which would fall fully a half mile beyond the objective and at least 2 miles beyond the point where it should have been placed.

For some reason, never quite determined, the corps artillery did not receive the order to support the Thirty-fifth Division. The Army artillery had been ordered not to support it, and its own artillery fire, through a mistake, was useless. Thus the infantry had to advance without artillery support against first-class German divisions, who occupied a stronger strategical disposition of terrain. But this was not all. When the order was received for the advance at 9 p. m., September 28, the Thirty-fifth Division had about one-half a mile of telephone wire. The Army staff offensive plan called for a 7-mile advance. The officers of the Thirty-fifth borrowed about 2 miles of wire from the artillery and with this inadequate means of liaison they went into action.

Five-thirty o'clock in the morning was the time set for the advance. The front-line troops waited for the rolling barrage, which would protect them. None came. Inky darkness enveloped the division. Companies lost their battalions, brigades became separated. Commands which were several miles behind the front line did not know where the front line was. Brigades were halted in ravines until their officers could communicate with headquarters and find out what had happened to the artillery. It developed that some companies had had nothing to eat for two days and had started back to the rear before the advance orders were received.

Finally, about 125 men of a front-line regiment, which had been broken to pieces by the inability of the commands to keep in touch with each other, took up the advance. These men went forward to the town of Exermont, meeting some resistance and sustaining many casualties. Instead of a united advance, adequately supported by artillery fire, 125 men dashed through the opening and gained a portion of the objective. What had happened to the others?

The major in command of one battalion sent a man through the dense fog about 10 o'clock in the morning of the 29th to division headquarters with this message: "Am intrenched along road. Expecting counterattack and flank movement by enemy. Lost communication with other commands. Will hold position as long as possible."

The men at headquarters looked up this battalion's position as given by its commander. He was intrenched 2 miles behind the original front line of the division and 9 miles from his objective. Needless to say, the counterattack did not eventuate and no reinforcements were rushed.

Other officers communicated in much the same way. The river protected the division from flank attack on the left. But one captain reported a heavy enemy force threatening his advance and declared that he "would make a fight of it," although he was only lost in the fog and thought a movement of division reserves 3 miles in the rear was a hostile force swinging into action.

About the middle of the morning great anxiety was felt by the division staff over the silence of the One hundred and thirty-eighth Infantry, which was supposed to have rushed ahead of its prescribed objective. Officers worriedly awaited news.

Then the fog lifted. There, down the road a little piece from staff headquarters, the One hundred and thirty-eighth waited. Its commanding officer had received no orders to advance. Other battalions were found in like condition. There was absolutely no coordinated action.

The small party which took the town of Exermont was driven back during the afternoon by the arrival of the Fifty-second Division of German Infantry. Reports began to come in of mixed commands. There was no panic. Companies meeting suicidal resistance merely retired to positions they could hold. Here and there an officer became nervous and dashed off a report of "stupefied, terrified, retreating troops." But for the main, the Thirty-fifth made the best of an intolerable situation.

The offensive failed because the Thirty-fifth Division was not ready for front-line fighting; because it had no properly prepared offensive and no liaison with which to act as a unit. The order issued by the general commanding the first army retiring the division for reorganization was the only thing which could have been done under the circumstances.

---

---

## XII. AGRICULTURAL HISTORY

---

---



# THE SCANDINAVIAN ELEMENT AND AGRARIAN DISCONTENT

(Abstract of paper)

By THEODORE C. BLEGEN, Hamline University

The chief motive underlying the immigration of approximately two and one-half million Scandinavians to the United States since 1825 has been economic. With Illinois as a nucleus after 1834, Scandinavian agricultural settlements radiated northward and westward in Illinois, Wisconsin, Iowa, Minnesota, and the Dakotas. The dissemination of reliable information in Norway and Sweden as to agricultural conditions in the Middle West depended first on America letters, then on returned immigrants, books, pamphlets, and later on emigration agents representing exploiting interests. The effect on peasants and artisans is evidenced in the increase of the Scandinavian contingent to 8 per cent of American immigration in the decade 1841-1850, to 9 per cent 1851-1860, and to over 12 per cent from 1881 to 1890. The Scandinavians contributed primarily as farmers to the building of the Northwest. After grappling with the earlier economic problems of new settlers they soon interested themselves in American institutions and political problems. The first Norwegian newspaper published in America, advocating the Free Soil Party, foreshadowed the affiliation of the Scandinavians with the Republican Party, and this affiliation was not shaken for 20 years after the Civil War. Two general causes resulted in considerable defections of Scandinavians in the nineties: The agrarian movement, particularly the Farmers' Alliance and Populism, and the enormous increments of immigrants unfamiliar with the Republican tradition. The important defection of Norwegians in western Minnesota in 1890 was purely agrarian in origin. The support then given by the Scandinavian element to the Farmers' Alliance was a signal for increased political "recognition" of the Scandinavians, but analyses of successive elections indicate that in their own voting the Scandinavians have been influenced almost exclusively by economic and political, rather than by racial, reasons. The tendency to independent voting was fostered by agrarian defections during the period of Populism, and perhaps foreshadowed the considerable support given by the Scandinavians in western Minnesota and North Dakota to the most recent manifestation of agrarian discontent.

This paper was discussed by Dr. KENDRIC C. BABCOCK, of the University of Illinois, Prof. ALBERT L. KOHLMEIER, of the University of Indiana, and others.

# THE WISCONSIN DOMESDAY BOOK IN AGRICULTURAL HISTORY

(Abstract of paper)

By JOSEPH SCHAFER, Wisconsin State Historical Society

The Wisconsin Domesday Book has been described as a plan by which the history of local communities in Wisconsin, and first of all rural communities, shall be studied intensively.

We are to-day more deficient in exact knowledge of the beginnings of rural life than of any other phase of life. Very little actual research has been done on that subject, as contrasted with the vast amount of research which has been devoted to the history of towns and cities, the growth of commerce, and so forth. We have a tradition about the pioneer age, but traditional information is proverbially inexact, and there is reason to believe that many things about pioneering have come to be cast in conventional molds. Whatever may be the fact about pioneering in other portions of the United States, the first settlers in southern Wisconsin were not as a rule in love with the cruder phases of pioneer life. They were earnest, industrious, enterprising people, largely from the northeastern part of America and from various European countries, whose ideal was settled and well-developed community life, for which they strove with eager energy.

The records used, and the process of study of rural towns, make possible certain generalizations about the agricultural history of Wisconsin. In the first place, the records of land entries reveal the extent and character and, also, the causes of land speculation. They show us, also, where settlement took place at a given time, and the reasons for it. Again, they show just what types of land the average home maker wanted. We find that the prevailing ideal of a farm among those who settled in southeastern Wisconsin was a fine tract of high prairie for cultivation and cropping; a wood lot of 40 or 80 acres, if possible adjacent to the prairie; a tract of low prairie "swale" or marsh for hay and pasture. A very complete demonstration on the last point is made from the history of the town of Mount Pleasant, in Racine County, by means of a map showing the topography, the forested areas, and the dates of entry of all tracts of land in the township.

This intensive study also shows how much of a handicap those settlers assumed who went into the forested townships as against

the settlers who took up the prairie lands. The statistics of farm making prove that settlers in the forest required about 30 years to make their farms, while the prairie settlers had theirs under cultivation in 5 or 10 years. On the other hand, it seems as if those who made farms in the forest appreciated them more highly than the others, because those families appear to be more permanent than the prairie settlers. The reason may be found in the fact that the prairie settlers used their lands too exclusively for wheat growing, and when the lands refused longer to raise wheat at a profit they were prone to sell and go into new prairie regions, such as Iowa, Minnesota, and the Dakotas.

The paper discussed the transition period between wheat growing and the more permanent agriculture, dairying and the way in which the leadership of individuals and of towns in agricultural improvement can be detected by the Domesday Book process. It concluded, "However, we are not boring for salt but for oil. Our concern is much more with the social result of the rural economic process than with that process itself. To the extent of our facilities we investigate social conditions at different periods, noting the types of people making up the given community, gauging the character of its social institutions, identifying its leaders and measuring the influence it exerted on society elsewhere through the contribution of its human surplus. Believing that the most important crop raised on the farms of Wisconsin is the farmer's family of children; believing also that a community's best gift to society is in its trained and educated youth, the study of education in these local areas becomes a matter of highest interest."

# THE INFLUENCE OF AGRICULTURAL CONDITIONS UPON LOUISIANA STATE POLITICS DURING THE NINETIES

(Abstract of paper)

By MELVIN J. WHITE, Tulane University

Hard times in the late eighties and the nineties fell with particular severity upon the small white farmer in the hill parishes of Louisiana, and the result was the growth of discontent. The Louisiana farmers were already organized by means of the Farmers' Alliance. This organization had been active in politics before, and with the growth of discontent its members naturally joined the People's Party. A ticket was put in the field in 1892 and the platform of the national organization adopted. Locally, however, the party was interested in bringing about a large number of political reforms in the State. The movement became formidable because of an alliance with the Republicans, which continued until the presidential campaign of 1896. In 1894 the sugar planters, angered at the loss of the sugar bounty and at the Democratic attitude on the tariff, joined the Republicans and their allies. The fusion made a strong opposition for the Democrats to overcome in the nicely balanced political situation which resulted. The negro vote became of value. He was used freely in the State election of 1896, which was disorderly in the extreme and which culminated in a contest over the governorship that nearly resulted in civil war.

The people were now convinced of the necessity for political reforms. A new election law in the summer of 1896, and the Constitution of 1898, redressed most of the grievances of which the People's Party had complained. The greater number of its members had returned to the Democratic ranks by the fall of 1896, but a few continued with the organization until 1900.

*Discussion.*—Mr. C. W. RAMSDELL, of the University of Texas, called attention to the important part played by the credit system, in other States than Louisiana, in arousing the farmers to discontent with their old party organizations. The crop-credit system forced the farmer to sell his crop as soon as gathered, regardless of price. The price almost invariably declined while the crop was being dumped on the market, to rise again after the cotton had passed out of the farmer's hands. In Texas in 1888 this brought about an elaborate scheme of cooperatives marketing and cooperative purchasing of supplies. As this diverted business out of the ordinary channels, business men generally fought it. The farmer's program was declared "undemocratic" and many of the Farmers' Alliance leaders were read out of the Democratic Party. The result was not only the organization of the People's Party, but a split in the Democratic Party itself. The Hogg-Clark campaign in 1892, though nominally over the railroad commission question, was at bottom a contest between the agrarian and conservative business interests, and served as a sort of curtain-raiser for the intensely dramatic fight in the national organization in 1896.

# AGRICULTURAL RECONSTRUCTION IN NORTH CAROLINA AFTER THE CIVIL WAR

(Abstract of paper)

By W. W. CARSON, De Pauw University

Eastern North Carolina developed the plantation system worked by negro slaves. The plantation occurred but did not dominate in the Piedmont. Many farms there were worked by white owners. Readjustment in agricultural labor after the Civil War was relatively easier in the western than in the eastern section of the State.

Freedom for the slaves necessitated far-reaching social and economic changes. An attempt was made by planters to continue the plantation system with wages substituted for slave labor. This was true particularly in the coastal plain. This effort occurred during the years 1866 and 1867.

The negro proved reasonably satisfactory as a laborer during 1865 and 1866; but the negro's reaction to freedom was affected by many forces of northern origin which combined to make the negro increasingly unsatisfactory as a wage laborer. This culminated in 1867. A short cotton crop and the low price of cotton in the fall of 1867 brought financial distress to most planters, and the growing conviction that the negro was a failure as a wage laborer forced a new arrangement between landlord and laborer. This was the "share system" wherein the landlord furnished the land, and the laborer cultivated and harvested the crop which would be divided on an agreed ratio.

Closely allied with the "share system" was the growth of the crop lien system. Supplies would be furnished the farmer by the merchant who secured his advances through a first lien on the growing crop. This caused an overplanting of cotton and tobacco to the exclusion of food and forage crops and the consequent necessity of purchasing the latter from the merchant at high interest rates for the credit advanced.

A rapid extension of cotton culture westward occurred after the Civil War. This was possible through the extensive use of commercial fertilizers which hastened the maturing of the crop before killing frosts in the autumn. Tobacco underwent an evolution after 1865 in the increasing cultivation of the mild and yellow "Virginia brights" which could be produced on land hitherto considered poor and of little value. This enabled areas of the State which had long been backward and undeveloped to achieve prosperity in the two decades following 1865.

# THE SOIL FACTOR IN PENNSYLVANIA AND VIRGINIA COLONIZATION

(Abstract of paper)

By ARCHER B. HULBERT, Colorado College

In the Lancaster County region of Pennsylvania rose America's first granary. New England had produced little wheat. In the tidewater of Virginia soil wheat ran all to stock and not to head. On these interior belts of limestone in Pennsylvania (and Maryland and Virginia) was grown the wheat without which, Washington said, the Revolutionary War could not be continued.

The influence of this region, and other regions like this, on American pioneer expansion has not been properly emphasized from the soil—and crop—standpoint.

These magnificent Pennsylvania crops, raised in a country not accessible by tidewater rivers, had a vital effect on creating means of transportation. Thus Pennsylvania took the lead in the American colonies in developing transportation, the preeminent factor in the building of our Republic. The Conestoga horse, the Conestoga wagon, the Lancaster turnpike (America's first macadamized road), the first American canal of length, the first scientifically graded road, the first steamboat, and the first steam engine to ply a highway were all Pennsylvania products.

In this wheat-growing region the necessary tools of American immigration, horses and wagons, were fashioned. And these were complemented by that region becoming the center of firearms manufacture in colonial days. Being the richest of our agricultural zones, Pennsylvania could first afford the surplus men, horses, wagons, arms for a great migratory wave.

The movement began nearly half a century before the Revolutionary War and followed the line of the limestone belts across Maryland to the Potomac and up the Valley of Virginia. It was made famous in later days by the Finleys, Lincolns, Hanks, and Boones who led it over the Cumberlands into the limestone blue-grass region of Kentucky and Tennessee.

Portions of American history will be made plainer when the influence of soil factors is studied more carefully. The legendary Daniel Boone, for example, was a very different character from the Daniel Boone of the Kentucky land-office records. Whatever else it did, Boone's 20 months of aimless rambling in Kentucky, prior to 1771, did little toward locating for the world the rich blue-grass region. This

was done by Deputy Surveyors Douglass, Taylor, Floyd, and Hite for Surveyor General William Preston of Virginia in 1772-1774. In these crucial years Boone never visited Kentucky. When he came again in 1775 to play his brave part in Indian fighting the richest part of Kentucky had already been explored and, in large measure, appropriated.

A careful study of soil and vegetation influences would lead to a rewriting of much of pioneer history.



---

---

XIII. THE HISTORY OF CIVILIZATION

---

---



## NEW LIGHT ON THE ORIGINS OF CIVILIZATION

(Abstract of paper)

BY JAMES HENRY BREASTED, University of Chicago

The lost trail of our cultural ancestry leads far across the ancient lands of the Near Orient, for the great unexplored areas of human history lie in that region. Organization for comprehensive historical study of these areas is almost totally lacking in the United States. In those American universities in which oriental studies are represented by a staff large enough to form a department we find the orientalist everywhere organized, like the departments of Latin and Greek, to teach languages. In view of the evident insufficiency of such an organization, it is extraordinary that since the early days of Johns Hopkins University, where it first appeared, it should have persisted to the present day. For while every oriental department must obviously teach languages, it is equally obvious that productive orientalist must also share in the great task of recovering a whole group of lost civilizations, the very civilizations, moreover, from which our own is ultimately descended.

The recognition of this fact at once involves the orientalist in obligations reaching far beyond the classroom and the seminar. These obligations have never been so evident as during the last two years, when the ancient lands of western Asia, where civilization and the great world religions were born, have been emancipated from the tyranny of the Turk and for the first time since the rise of modern science have been rendered safe and accessible, except in Asia Minor, to research and investigation. Here and in northeastern Africa lie the unexplored areas of history. The study of these lands is the birthright and the sacred legacy of all civilized peoples. Their delivery from the Turk brings to us an opportunity such as the world has never seen before and will never see again. In so far, moreover, as the financially overburdened governments of Europe may feel themselves obliged to curtail their former subventions for research in the Orient the opportunity and the obligation is correspondingly greater for us in America.

It is evident that the opening of Asia Minor, Syria, Palestine, Mesopotamia, and Babylonia to modern business and to enlightened

exploitation in mining, railroad building, manufactures, and especially agriculture with its great irrigation projects, means the rapid destruction of the great ruined cities and buried records of early man with which these lands are filled. Only a few years ago the imposing records of the earliest mining enterprises known, stately sculptures on the rocks in the mineral-bearing valleys of Sinai, some of them *the oldest historical monuments inscribed by man*, were brutally wrecked and destroyed by the foremen and workmen of a modern mining company endeavoring to restore and exploit the old mines of the region. This kind of thing will soon be going on throughout the Near East.

To these destructive forces must be added those of natural decay, native vandalism, and illicit excavation for profit by natives. The modern natives are much too ignorant to feel any respect or reverence for the venerable associations among which they live, and a vast amount of destruction is constantly going on at their hands without any conscious purpose to destroy on their part. At Napata, the capital of ancient Ethiopia, I found the natives taking out the masonry from the temple of King Tirhaka (the Ethiopian adversary of Sennacherib) in order to secure blocks of stone to lay over the bodies of their dead in the neighboring modern cemetery. They had been doing this for generations. The buildings on the fringes of the mound covering the great Syrian city of Kadesh on the Orontes, which I visited in 1920, have long been going block by block to feed the neighboring limekilns of the natives; and chapters recounting such destruction all over the ancient lands of the Near East might be indefinitely multiplied.

Again, there are still little known or rarely visited sites of ancient cities where even a preliminary examination may result in saving priceless records. One can not but recall that at the Hittite capital of Khatti (Asia Minor) Winckler, on one of his first walks about the place, kicked out with his boot heel documents from the royal archives of the Hittite foreign office which were lying only a few inches below the surface. Wagonloads of royal records lay just below. The result was the discovery of materials which have made possible the decipherment of the lost Hittite language.

Besides such written records and archæological remains, many of which are sufficiently portable to be transported to the museums of the West, there is a vast body of fact observable only in the various habitats of the leading civilizations of the ancient Near East. The systematic collection of these observations has hardly begun. This will be evident when we recall that the wild ancestor of our domestic wheat was discovered in Palestine as late as 1906. Surveys by a considerable group of natural scientists will be required to furnish us

with exhaustive maps of the present distribution of plants, animals, and minerals in western Asia and northeastern Africa. At the same time extensive studies of the surface geology will be necessary throughout the same region in order to furnish the materials which will enable the paleobotanist and paleontologist to give us a full catalogue of the plants and animals of the near eastern world in remote prehistoric times, when savage man was still engaged in the long struggle which was to lead him to the threshold of earliest civilization. The meteorological history of the region also needs much further investigation. We shall then possess the facts from which we can reconstruct the natural environment of prehistoric man in this region, without which we can not trace his subsequent career and his rise to civilization.

Here, then, is a large and comprehensive task—the systematic collection of the facts from the monuments, from the written records, and from the physical habitat, and the organization of these facts into a great body of historical archives. The scattered fragments of man's story have never been brought together by anyone. Yet they must be brought together by some efficient organization and collected under one roof before the historian can draw out of them and reveal to modern man the story of his own career. The most important missing chapters in that story, the ones which will reveal to us the earliest transition from the savagery of the prehistoric hunter to the social and ethical development of the earliest civilized communities of our own cultural ancestors—these are the lost chapters of the human career which such a body of organized materials from the Near East will enable us to recover.

Attached to a department organized exclusively to teach languages, bound down by an inflexible teaching program, and without financial resources, the university teacher is as totally helpless single-handed to cope with a situation like this as would be the astronomer whose time and strength were absorbed by the classroom while he endeavored to study the skies without his staff or his observatory.

NOTE.—The rest of the paper by Doctor Breasted was devoted to an account of the Oriental Institute, at the University of Chicago, made possible through the generous interest of Mr. John D. Rockefeller.

The topical headings given will indicate the activities described: The Assyrian dictionary; The forerunners of the Book of the Dead; An encyclopedic card index of monuments and discoveries; Expeditions of the New Institute; Airplane observations; Purchase of new records from oriental antiquity dealers; First archaeological expedition through western Asia after the war; The monuments of Rome in the Orient; The first white men to cross the new Arab State; The new ancient Egyptian medical book; The earliest occurrence of the elixir of youth.

# THE RELATION OF THE FINE ARTS TO THE HISTORY OF CIVILIZATION

(Abstract of paper)

BY FERDINAND SCHEVILL, University of Chicago

For such a field as the history of civilization, which is either new land or old land recently reopened for cultivation, there is imperative need of theoretic preparation. What is the place of the fine arts in the history of civilization? Are they the expression of the aspirations of a whole people? Or rather of a ruling class, a priesthood or nobility? What is the relation of the fine arts to religion? What to science?

Without doubt progress has become the unifying principle for all present-day historians of civilization. Mr. H. G. Wells and his *Outline of History* illustrate the point. The concept of progress has come to the historians from the biologists and determines for them the organization of their material. All living historians approach their subject with the assumption that man has struggled upward from the lower animals and that he faces an indefinitely expanding destiny. Astonishing as it may sound, the fine arts lend no support whatever to this universally accepted thesis.

The outstanding art periods of history may be enumerated as follows: The Egyptian; the Assyrian; the Hellenic; the Indian; the Chinese; the West European or Occidental. Is there in these art periods, arranged here in chronological succession, anything perceptible which even remotely resembles an ascending movement, an uninterrupted progression? To the sensitized critic the very idea is absurd. Each period is absolutely independent of the other, is *sui generis*. The great art periods are separate, coordinated growths, slightly, though often, interdependent, but under no circumstances are they to be conceived as successive phases of a single, definite unfolding. Each art expression, historically considered, regularly developed from its own center, came, like a plant or any other living organism, to its growth and fruition and then inexorably perished. The sole contention of this paper is that the fine arts can not be successfully organized under that concept which has determined all our recent forms of historical thought, the concept of progress.

# DEVELOPMENT OF THE ART OF WAR

(Abstract of paper)

By Brig. Gen. EBEN SWIFT, United States Army, retired

Although war has been the principal occupation of man, he has been slow to learn and he has had great disadvantages to overcome.

The natural antagonism of one male for another perhaps caused the son of the first man to murder his brother. As the earth became populated the jealousies and necessities of tribes and families led to conflict. Man grew into a fighting animal, although he never liked it, and never ceased to seek methods by which he could slaughter his enemy with the least danger to himself.

The first battles were the collisions of poorly armed mobs. The leaders had small influence except by personal example. The duel between David and Goliath shows a typical case. A slight advantage on one side led to a stampede and rout of the enemy. Early lessons were learned in the value of ambush and surprise, ruse and strategem, perfidy and deceit.

The problem of handling the armed mob was solved by drill and discipline. In this way small numbers acting under a common impulse could win against greater numbers, even when the latter were individually the best and bravest. The first organization was named the phalanx. It consisted of a solid square of men in close ranks and deep files, the rear ranks armed with long pikes which projected through the intervals of the front rank.

The phalanx is shown in stone carvings of Sumerians and Hittites, from 3,500 to 7,000 years ago.

The methods of drill and discipline were old in Greece at the beginning of recorded history, 2,500 years ago. Our attention is first called by Epaminondas, a Theban general, who not only commanded an improved phalanx but practiced strange innovations in battle. His reinforced center and his flank attack surprised and confounded the best soldiers of that age, but they are simple enough to-day. Alexander the Great and his father were pupils of Epaminondas.

The phalanx was unwieldy, weak on its flanks, and unable to maneuver except over level ground. When possible the battle field was carefully smoothed off for the convenience of the fighters. The phalanx went down several hundred years later before the Roman legion, which combined flexibility with the resistless power of the well-drilled mass.

The world continued to belong to the man with drilled and disciplined soldiers. There was one short break of 17 years when Hannibal suddenly appeared in Italy with an inferior and poorly armed army of mixed races. The task of the legion up to that time had been so easy that the Roman generals had never seen the use of advance, flank, and rear guards. Hannibal ambushed and destroyed an army of 40,000 in an hour or so. He soon had the proud Romans in such a state that they dared not face him at all in the open field. He chased them over Italy with insignificant loss, using the ancient devices of ambush, surprise, ruse, and strategem on a larger scale than ever before and with terrible effect. The Romans called it punic war—dirty fighting. At a later day the armored knights felt the same way about gunpowder and the "vile guns."

After the fall of Rome the military as well as the peaceful arts fell into decay for a few centuries. The former reached the lowest point at the Battle of Anghiari, in the fifteenth century, when two armies fought for four hours, with a total loss of one man who was killed by a fall from his horse.

About the middle of the eighteenth century we find again the well-drilled army, this time using a firearm which was fired in 122 motions, and practicing the "parade step." In the skillful hands of Frederick it fought the untrained armies of Europe for many years.

French officers serving in America during the Revolutionary War probably saw the first use of skirmishers, which was an improvement on the rigid drill of Frederick of Prussia.

Only 10 years after the death of Frederick an obscure lieutenant of artillery came along, riding upon the wave of a revolution, fully armed and equipped with a new lesson in the art of war. This man was Napoleon Bonaparte.

Up to that time soldiers only knew how to win on the field of battle itself. No one had seen how an inferior army, directed by a superior intelligence, could be moved outside of the battle field in such a way as to make the victory sure even before the real fighting began. That was the lesson taught by Napoleon. It well deserves the name "strategy," from the Greek word which means "generalship."

America furnished a worthy successor in Robert E. Lee, 46 years after Waterloo. He made war under greater disadvantages than any great commander except Hannibal and perhaps Napoleon in his last two campaigns. While all great generals before him had inherited a ready-made army Lee, like Washington and Pershing, made his own army. He fought men of the same race and generals of the same school as himself. He proved the fallacy of the theorists who preached the doctrine that strategy was bound by rules. He boldly planned the enterprises which they condemned. For instance,

he used converging columns which met upon the field of battle, later accepted by Moltke with great effect; he detached an inferior force against the enemy's rear; he uncovered his line of retreat and fought battles in that position; he retreated across a great river in the presence of the enemy; he attacked both flanks and the center of a superior army in position and walked away undisturbed; his battles in the woods have not been excelled, even in the Argonne; his use of field intrenchments was original. If he did not get such decisive results as Napoleon, it was because he fought better soldiers who were armed with more deadly weapons.

Peace training, mobilization, and concentration came next, making the third revolution in the art of war in 100 years.

It started in Prussia during the days following her defeat by Napoleon in 1806. Each year a contingent of young men were called to the colors, given intensive training, discharged into the reserve, and held there subject to call. A few years of this system made a great army. The training of officers for high command was then for the first time reduced to logical form. An applicatory system of instruction furnished leaders and staff officers who were able to go to war, after years of peace training, with the confidence of veterans of many battles. Military men were thus the last to learn practical methods which had always been familiar in the trades, professions, arts, and sciences. The balance of the military world, with its customary dullness in getting a new idea, looked on with indifference, but was rudely awakened in 1870. In that year the Germans increased the peace army to a million men in eight days; in another eight days they had three armies concentrated behind the French frontier ready to march; in about four weeks more the Emperor Napoleon III surrendered.

The World War followed in 44 years. It was the graveyard of much military art that had a tremendous success in other wars.

Where the defeated side in old times was slaughtered by the hundred thousand, in the modern battle it is the victor who loses the most men killed. It takes a better and a braver man to win now, but whether this will discourage war is yet to be seen.

Fifty years ago the statement that it took a man's weight in lead to kill him in battle was considered extravagant. Fifteen years ago it took 4 tons of lead and iron. Now it takes 20 tons.

Gas suddenly comes to the front with one-third of the casualties, but the proportion of killed is not so large as with other missiles.

To get men to accept the danger and discomfort of war it has always been necessary to appeal to their best or their worst passions. Honor, duty, patriotism, fanaticism, hate, selfishness, or the hope of plunder, have all served as potent aids. Psychological results are quickly secured by assertion, repetition, and contagion

until the tribe or nation is inoculated with a single idea. We may now expect that this weapon will be used against ourselves, and that the enemy will use it to spread his own propaganda in our own Army and in our own home.

The blockade has always been a valuable aid. Now its effect is likely to be multiplied by famine resulting from the lack of men who are producing food.

A short war is won by a great general with a well trained army. A long war is won by the nation with the most money and the most men.

# COMMERCE AND ECONOMICS

(Abstract of paper)

By W. L. WESTERMAN, Cornell University

The interest of the economists of the present day seems to have centered upon the investigation of "markets" and "business cycles." Their methods and their sources of information are entirely statistical. Consequently, they have correctly restricted their field of study to that period in which statistical data are available. The difficulties of obtaining trustworthy results by the methods of statistical analysis are obvious. Yet the results already obtained by these economic investigators are enough to show that they are working upon sound and promising lines.

Historians are necessarily interested in the economic changes which appear in the particular period with which each investigator is concerned. If this new economic type of research gives the results which it seems likely to do, the historian who has economic interests will find himself compelled to choose between one of two methods of work. If his interest lies in the period preceding the time of coherent and continuous statistical data, that is, before a date which is to be fixed at about 1800 A. D., he will not have data in sufficient quantity to warrant statistical treatment. His results will be non-scientific in point of exactness; and they must be clearly regarded, and as clearly depicted, as estimates, impressionistic conclusions, or mere opinions, as the case may be.

The historian who works in the later period and in those countries which afford economic data in sufficient quantity and of trustworthy character must either acquaint himself with the methodical use of statistical data or he must accept the results presented to him by those economists who do follow this method. In other words, we must recognize the simple and undeniable fact that preceding the period of the collection and publication of statistical data there does not exist a body of statistical data either continuous enough or sufficiently trustworthy to warrant treatment by the statistical method with the hope of obtaining scientific results. Roughly speaking, this may be defined as the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The same conclusion applies, and ever in higher degree, to the investigation of "sociological" questions in history, because of the absence of all "vital" statistics for the ancient, medieval, and early modern periods of history.



---

#### XIV. THE HISTORY OF SCIENCE

---



## THE HISTORY OF SCIENCE

Prof. CHARLES H. HASKINS, of Harvard University, told of the OPPORTUNITIES FOR RESEARCH IN THE HISTORY OF SCIENCE IN EUROPEAN LIBRARIES.

---

## AMERICAN HISTORY AND THE NATURAL SCIENCES

(Abstract of paper)

By ARCHER B. HULBERT, Colorado College

The natural sciences offer factors only for the clarification of history, and their value as factors is fatally handicapped if they are worshiped as anything more than factors in a great problem.

Geography, botany, geology, climatology, aerography, and hydrography have all played a part in making clearer some portions of our history. Professor Fernald, in his effort to settle the long-disputed location of the Northmen's colony by a study of the plants described in the old sagas, discovered that in Iceland the plants mentioned in the Northmen's legends were the mountain cranberry, canoe birch, and strand wheat. These are found about the Gulf of St. Lawrence and northward, plainly indicating the site of their colony in that region, not in New England.

Another type of investigation is the study of the explorations of our American coast in the light of our new knowledge of aerography and hydrography. The late Professor Davidson, of the University of California, by his knowledge of tides, fogs, sea floor, and wind currents was able to throw new light on the cruising of the first Pacific coast explorers and to prove that Sir Francis Drake could not have fared northward beyond 43° north latitude and did not give England a claim to what is now Oregon and Washington. Why Cartier missed the mouth of the St. Lawrence on his first voyage has been made plain by a study of ocean currents thereabouts; also why the Pilgrims landed at Cape Cod instead of going farther south, as they intended. Any careful study of the hydrography of the Mississippi and St. Lawrence Rivers explains why one should have been a famous key to the continent and the other should not. The St. Lawrence would have been a great avenue of exploration had there been no Great Lakes at its head, because its mouth is not blocked with silt, etc., and because the ocean tides sweep up so far.

A study of American soils and vegetation will measurably aid in explaining the vagaries of American expansion and the distribution of the pioneer hosts westward. As the work of the Bureau of Soils progresses the way is opened for constructive work in this line. The affinities of certain European stocks for certain environments has been disclosed; that of the Pennsylvania Dutch for limestone soil and the Scotch-Irish aversion for the same until prejudices of Old World origin had been overcome. The relation of development of transportation to the first American wheat growing areas, explains why such areas, as Lancaster County, Pa., become, naturally, the breeding grounds of migration because there the tools of migration—horses, wagons, firearms, etc.—were first to be had in surplus quantities.

If the student keeps a proper balance, the study of the natural sciences and their connection with our history will lead to unexpected results.

# INDEX

Compiled by H. S. Parsons, Library of Congress

- Abbott, Wilbur C., of writing of hist. com. (1922), 21, 51, 90.
- Abel, Annie H., of hist. mss. com. (1922), 18, 50, 89.
- Adams, Charles K., *Manual of Hist. Lit.*, 65-66.
- Adams, George B., councillor A. H. A. (1922), 11, 17; chairman, board of editors, *Studies in European hist.* (1922), 20, 91.
- Agenda, A. H. A. com. (1922), 17, 91; report (1921), 52-53, 83-85, 86; railway and Pullman fair, 87; report on advertising in *Am. Hist. Rev.*, 87.
- Agricultural history, papers on (1921), 40-41, 217-225.
- Agricultural History Society, joint sessions with A. H. A. (1921), 29, 40.
- Agricultural Reconstruction in N. C. after the Civil War*, Carson, 40, (abstract) 223.
- Aiton, Arthur S., *Establishment of the Viceroyalty in the New World—a Projection of Spanish Institutions*, 34, (abstract) 172-173.
- Alden, George H., of P. C. B. resolutions com. (1921), 102.
- Alexander the Great, 233.
- Allen, William, papers, 113.
- Allison, J. M. S., *July Days and After*, 37-38, (abstract) 163-164.
- Allison, William H., of bibliog. com. (1922), 19, 51, 89; report of bibliog. com. (1921), 65-69.
- Alvord, Clarence W., of Brussels hist. cong. com. (1922), 21, 91; *In re the Am. People vs. George III*, 38-39, (abstract) 182-184; *Miss. Valley in British Politics*, 180.
- American Audit Co., audit of A. H. A. treas. accts., 57-59.
- American Catholic Historical Association, sessions (1921), 30.
- American colonial history, luncheon conf. on. (1921), 34, 177-179.
- American colonies, financial relations with England, 34, 177; increase in knowledge of, 178-179.
- American council of learned societies, A. H. A. delegates in (1922), 17, 51, 60, 90; organization of, 76; report (1921), 88; revision of Du Cange's *Glossarium* referred to, 88.
- American Council on Education, established, 75, 76.
- American Economic Association, represented in Natl. Council of Teachers of Social Studies, 32.
- American Expeditionary Forces, conserving hist. material, 88.
- American Historical Association, act of incorporation, 4; constitution, 9; by-laws, 10; officers elected for 1922, 11, 12, 52; terms of office, 14-16; officers and committees (1922), 16-21, 89-90; organization and activities, 21-23; historical prizes, 23-25; membership, 25-26, 43, 53; represented in Natl. Council of Teachers of Social Studies, 32; amds. to constitution, 49-50; deaths (1921), 53-54. See also Annual report.—Budget.—Endowment for A. H. A.—Finances.
- American Historical Review*, board of editors (1922), 18, 44, 50, 89; report of treas. (1921), 57; report of Am. Audit Co. on finances (1921), 59; report of bd. of editors (1921), 85; advertising in, 87.
- American history, conference on (1921), 175-216.
- American History and the Natural Sciences* (abstract), Hulbert, 241-242.
- American Hotel Annex, vote of thanks to, 88.
- American Indian in the World War*, Wise, 70.
- American Library Association, to assign fields of collection, 68.
- American Political Science Association, represented in Natl. Council of Teachers of Social Studies, 32; cooperation in plan for university center in Washington, 74-75.
- American Revolution, session (1921), 38-39.
- American Revolution viewed in the Light of the Last Two Decades of Research*, Van Tyne, 38, (abstract) 180-181.
- American Sociological Society, represented in Natl. Council of Teachers of Social Studies, 32.
- American Struggle for the British West Indian Carrying Trade 1815-1880*, Bennis, 44, 50.
- Amsterdam, Holland, 130.
- Ancient history, session (1921), 36, 139-144.
- Anderson, F. M., of audit com. (1921), 49; report of audit com. (1921), 49, 57.
- Andrews, Charles M., chairman com. on obtaining transcripts from foreign archives (1922), 19, 51, 89; *Colonial Period*, 181; *Present Day Thoughts on the Am. Revolution*, 181.
- Anghiari, Battle of, 234.
- Anglo-American historical conference, suggested, 84.
- Annual meeting of A. H. A., program com. (1922), 17-18, 50, 89; local com. (1922) 18; PROCEEDINGS (1921), 27-94; place of meeting (1922), 43, 49, 60, 87, (1923), 44, 49, 87; program (1921), 45-49; vote of thanks to program com. (1921), 52; time, 90; attendance (1921), 92-94.
- Antwerp, Holland, 129.
- Appointments, A. H. A. com. (1922), 17, 91; report (1921), 89-90.
- Apremont, Reynolds, 70.
- Archives. See National archives.—Obtaining transcripts from foreign archives, A. H. A. com.
- Archives building, memorial authorized, 60, 84; memorial, 86.
- Archives Nationales, 115.
- Archivists. See Conference of archivists.
- Arrangements, P. C. B. com. (1921), 97.
- Asia Minor, research in, 229-230.
- Astoria, Irving, 187.
- Audit com. of A. H. A. (1921) appointed, 49; report (1921), 49, 57.
- Auditing com. of P. C. B., report (1921), 103.
- Austin, Stephen F., papers, 59, 62, 84, 86.
- Autobiography of Martin Van Buren*, 62.
- Babcock, Kendric C., discussion, 219

- Baldwin, Simeon E., councilor A. H. A. (1922), 11, 17.
- Ballagh, J. C., *Economic History, 1865-1909*, 197.
- Baltic States, manuscripts, 97-98.
- Baltimore, Md., metropolitan rivalry, 130.
- Bancroft, George, quotation, 180.
- Bancroft collection of Spanish mss., 179.
- Barker, Eugene C., of hist. mss. com. (1922), 18, 50, 89; *Stephen F. Austin papers*, 62.
- Barnes, Harry E., *Significance of Sociology for Economic and Social History*, 35-36; *Relation of Sociology to Social and Economic History* (abstract) 132-137.
- Barnes, W. C., chairman P. C. B. program com. (1921), 97.
- Bassett, John S., sec. A. H. A. (1922), 11, 16, 44, 52, 82; of agenda com. (1922), 17, 91; chairman meetings and relations com. (1922), 17, 91; of finance com. (1922), 17, 91; of appointments com. (1922), 17, 91; of publications com. (1922), 18, 50, 89, of writing of hist. com. (1922), 21, 51, 90; chairman com. to coop. with Peoples of Am. Soc. (1922), 21, 51, 84, 90; at meeting of agenda com. (1921), 52, 83; report as sec. (1921), 52-54, 85; report as sec. for Exec. Council (1921), 59-60; report of council com. on agenda (1921), 83-85; present at council meetings, 85, 87, 88.
- Beard, Charles A., of com. on plan for university center, 75.
- Becker, Carl, of board of editors, *Am. Hist. Rev.* (1922), 18; discussion, 38.
- Beer, George L., fundamental causes of Am. Revolution; 180.
- Bemis, Samuel F., *Jay's Treaty and the Northwest Boundary Gap*, 101-102; report of P. C. B. nominations com. (1921), 103; address, 105.
- Benns, F. Lee, Justin Winsor prize awarded to, 44, 59.
- Benton, Elbert J., of service com. (1922), 19, 51, 90.
- Berlin, Germany, metropolitan rivalry, 130.
- Bermont documents, 98.
- Bevans, James, report of P. C. B. auditing com. (1921), 103.
- Bibliography, A. H. A. com. (1922), 19, 51, 89; report (1921), 65-69, 85, 87; communication from J. T. Gerould referred to, 84; report on proposition made by Mr. Gerould, 87.
- Bibliography of American travel, A. H. A. sub-com. (1922), 19, 51, 89.
- Bibliography of historical societies, conf of hist. socs. com. on (1922), 18; (1921), 64; report (1921), 110.
- Bibliography of modern English history, A. H. A. spec. com. (1922), 20, 51, 90; report (1921), 84.
- Biography, eighteenth century colonial, 34, 178.
- Buxby, William K., chairman local com. (1921), 31.
- Blair, Frank P., of Mo., 186.
- Blakeslee, George H., of George L. Beer prize com. (1922), 20, 51, 90.
- Blegen, Theodore C., *Scandinavian Element and Agrarian Discontent*, 40-41, (abstract) 219; present at conf. of hist. socs. (1921), 111.
- Boak, Arthur E. R., of board of editors, *Studies in European hist.* (1922), 20, 91; *Recent Advances in our Knowledge of the Roman Empire*, 36, (abstract) 141.
- Bodenhafer, Walter B., discussion of sociology, 135-136.
- Bolton, Herbert K., Bancroft collection of Spanish mss., 179.
- Bonatti, Guido, *an Astrologer of the Thirteenth Century Mentioned by Dante*, Thorndike, 36, (abstract) 147-148.
- Bond, Beverly W., Jr., colonial agents, 34, 177-178; present at conf. of hist. socs. (1921), 111.
- Boone, Daniel, of Ky. land records, 224-225.
- Boston, Mass., metropolitan rivalry, 130.
- Boucher, C. S., of Justin Winsor prize com. (1922), 18, 50, 89.
- Bourne, Henry E., chairman nominations com. (1922), 17, 44, 52, 82; of hist. teaching in the schools com. (1922), 20, 51, 90; report of nominations com. (1921), 82-83.
- Bowles, Verne H., present at conf. of hist. socs. (1921), 111.
- Boyd, Allen R., letter of transmittal ann. rept., 5; editor A. H. A. (1922), 16; of publications com. (1922), 18, 50, 89; of military hist. com. (1922), 19, 51, 89.
- Boyd, William K., chairman hist. research in colleges com. (1922), 20, 51, 90; proposal to establish com. on research, 71-72, 84.
- Breasted, James H., wheat in ancient Egypt, 33; *New Light on the Origins of Civilization*, 35, (abstract) 229-231.
- Breck, Edward, of div. of hist., University Center for Research in Washington, 77, 80; of bd. of research advisers, Univ. Center for Research in Washington, 79.
- Breckenridge, William C., present at conf. of hist. socs. (1921), 111.
- Breckenridge papers, 113.
- Brigham, Clarence S., of service com. (1922), 19, 51, 90.
- British Jealousy of French Imperialism after 1815*, Moon, 37, 163.
- Brooks, Robert P., of hist. mss. com. (1922), 18, 50, 89.
- Brown, Louise Fargo, chairman membership com. (1922), 18, 50, 89.
- Brown collection, 114.
- Bruce, P. A., *Rise of the New South*, 197.
- Bruges, Belgium, 129.
- Brussels historical congress, A. H. A. spec. com. (1922), 21, 91.
- Buck, Solon J., of handbook of hist. socs. com. (1922), 19; (1921), 64; of bibliog. of Am. travel sub-com. (1922), 19, 51, 89; of pub. archives com. (1922), 19, 51, 89; society membership in conf. of hist. socs., 110; of conf. of hist. socs. natl. archives bldg. com. (1922), 110; present at conf. of hist. socs. (1921), 111.
- Budget of A. H. A. (1922), 49; (1923), 91.
- Bücher, —, duties of each portion of country, 128.
- Burr, George L., councilor A. H. A. (1922), 12, 17.
- Calendar of manuscripts in Paris archives rel. to the Miss. Valley, 190.
- Campaign and Battle of Spring Hill*, Hay, 70.
- Capen, S. P., of Univ. Center for Research in Washington, 79; sec. bd. of research advisers, Univ. Center for Research in Washington, 79.
- Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 77.
- Carnegie Institution, Dept. of Hist. Research to publish calendar of Parisian archives rel. to Miss. Valley, 64; access to scholars, 77.
- Carson, William W., *Agric. Reconstruction in N. C. after the Civil War*, 40, (abstract) 223.

- Cartier, —, exploration, 241.  
 Cattle ranching in Okla., 41  
*Causes of the World War*, Howland, 38, (abstract), 212-213.  
 Chandler, Charles L., of hist. congress at Rio de Janeiro spec. com. (1922), 20, 51, 90.  
 Channing, Edward, councillor A. H. A. (1922), 12, 17; of meetings and relations com (1922), 17, 91.  
 Chase, Philip P., of hist. teaching in the schools com. (1922), 20, 51, 90.  
 Chase, Salmon P., papers, 113.  
 Châteaubriand, 37.  
 Cheyney, Edward P., 1st vice pres. A. H. A. (1922), 11, 16, 44, 52, 82; of agenda com (1922), 17, 91; of appointments com. (1922), 17, 91; chairman bibliog. of mod. English hist. spec. com (1922), 20, 51, 90; at meeting of agenda com. (1921), 52, 83; report of bibliog. of mod. English hist. spec. com. (1921), 84; of com. to study and report on proposal to establish a com. on research (1921), 84, 87.  
 Chicago, Ill., metropolitan rivalry, 130.  
 Chicago Historical Soc., papers in, 114.  
 Chicago, University of, Oriental Institute, 35, 230.  
 Chouteau papers, 114.  
 Christian Commission, 196.  
 Christie, Francis A., *Field of Religious Development*, 39-40, (abstract), 196.  
 Cincinnati, O., metropolitan rivalry, 130.  
 City Club, St. Louis, vote of thanks to, 88.  
 Civil war, muster rolls, 113; problems out of, 192-193.  
 Civilization, *New Light on the Origins of*, Breasted, 35, (abstract), 229-231; *Relation of the Fine Arts to the Hist. of*, Schevill, 35, (abstract), 232; history of, 227-237.  
 Clark, Robert C., oral report of P. C. B. (1921), 44, 49, 90; pres. of P. C. B. (1921), 97; *Hudson Bay Co. and Early Oregon History*, 104.  
 Clay, Henry, and Mo. Compromise, 187.  
 Cleland, Robert G., councillor P. C. B. (1922), 13, 103.  
 Cleveland, O., metropolitan rivalry, 130.  
 Cluny, Monastery of, 149.  
 Cohen, Morris R., of Peoples of Am. Soc., 87.  
 Colby, Charles W., of writing of hist. com. (1922), 21, 51, 90  
 Cole, Arthur C., application of principles of hist. criticism to newspapers and periodicals, 39; *Use of the Newspaper and Periodical Sources* (abstract), 195.  
 College Entrance Examination Board, asked to prepare hist. questions, 88.  
 Colonial agents, 34, 177-178.  
*Colonial Period*, Andrews, 181.  
*Commerce and Economics*, Westerman, 35 (abstract), 237.  
*Commerce and Union Sentiment in the Old Northwest in 1860*, Kohlmeier, 42 (abstract), 205.  
 Commonwealth Fund, 73, 86.  
 Conference of archivists, meeting (1921), 32, 119-121.  
 Conference of historical societies, members (1922), 18, 51, 89; annual meeting (1921), 32-33; report (1921), 64-65, 84; PROCEEDINGS (1921), 107-117.  
 Conference of the Evangelical Alliance, 196.  
 Conference on American colonial history (1921), 34, 177-179.  
 Conference on English history (1921), 34, 153-155.  
 Conference on Hispanio-American history (1921), 34-35, 167, 170-174.  
 Conference on the history of science (1921), 33-34, 239-242.  
 Conference on the hist. of the Far East (1921), 35, 167-169.  
 Conference on the teaching of history in schools (1921), 119-124.  
 Constant, Benjamin, 37  
*Contribution to the History of the World War of a Group of Officers of the A. E. F.* (abstract), Thomas, 210-211  
 Coolidge, Archibald C., of board of editors, *Am. Hist. Rev.* (1922), 18.  
 Cooperation of historical societies and departments, conf. of hist socs com on, report (1921), 64.  
 Coulter, E. Merton, of hist. research in colleges com. (1922), 20, 51, 90.  
 Cox, Isaac J., chairman Justin Winsor prize com. (1922), 18, 50, 89; of hist. congress at Rio de Janeiro spec. com. (1922), 20, 51, 90; Spanish and French colonial hist., 179.  
 Cranmer, C. R., report of Am. Audit Co. on A. H. A. finances, 57-59  
 Crawford, Clarence C., *Study of English Legal History*, 34, 155.  
*Critical Problems Involved in the Use of the Official Records of the World War*, Stevens, 34, (abstract), 206-209.  
*Criticism of the Italian Settlement of 1815*, Frayer, 37 (abstract), 161  
 Cross, Arthur L., councillor A. H. A. (1922), 12, 17, 52, 82; of agenda com (1922), 17, 91; of bibliog. of mod. English hist spec. com. (1922), 20, 51, 90; history teaching, 34; at meeting of agenda com. (1921), 52, 83, present at council meetings, 85, 87, 88; *Recent Hist. Tendencies and a Suggestion* (abstract), 155.  
 Crothers, Prof., discussion of hist. teaching, 124.  
 Crusades, 150  
*Culture, Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries in the Hist. of*, Paetow, 36, (abstract), 151-152.  
 Cunningham, Charles H., of hist. congress at Rio de Janeiro spec. com. (1922), 20, 51, 90.  
 Cunningham transcripts, 115.  
 Dale, Edward E., cattle ranching in Okla., 41.  
 Dale, Harrison C., present at conf. of hist. socs. (1921), 111.  
*Danegeld in France*, Joranson, 44, 50, 62.  
 Daniels, Winthrop M., of Univ. Center for Research in Washington, 79, 80, of bd. of research advisers, Univ. Center for Research in Washington, 79.  
 Dante, *Astrologer of the Thirteenth Century Mentioned by*, Thorndike, 147-148; use of Latin, 151.  
 Darling, May, discussion, 106.  
 David and Goliath, 233.  
 Davidson, Prof., Univ. of Calif., Pacific coast explorers, 241.  
 Dawson, Edgar, of board of editors, *Hist. Outlook* (1922), 19, 51, 90.  
*Desirable Adjustments between History and the Other Social Sciences* (abstract), Tryon, Violette, and discussion, 121-124  
 Detroit, Mich., metropolitan rivalry, 130.  
*Development of Metropolitan Economy in Europe and America*, Gras, 35, (abstract), 127-132.  
*Development of the Art of War*, Swift, 35 (abstract), 233-236.

- Disposition of records, A. H. A. com. on (1921), discharged, 60, 87; report (1921), 61, 84.
- Doctrine of Mutual Aid*, Vestal, 70.
- Documentary historical publications of the U. S., A. H. A. spec. com. (1922), 21, 51, 90; report (1921), 84.
- Dodd, William E., of nominations com. (1922), 17, 44, 52, 82; of board of editors, *Am. Hist. Rev.* (1922), 18, 44, 50, 89; report of nominations com. (1921), 82-83.
- Donnan, Elizabeth, of membership com. (1922), 18, 50, 89.
- Dow, Earle W., *Town Privileges under the Establishments of Rouen*, 36-37 (abstract), 156.
- Down, R. H., of P. C. B. program com. (1921), 97.
- Drake, Sir Francis, explorations, 241.
- Draper, Lyman C., collection, 114.
- Drum, Gen., session on military hist., 70.
- Du Cange, *Glossarium*, 151; revision, 88.
- Dues, A. H. A., increase, 43, 49.
- Duncalf, Frederick, discussion of twelfth and thirteenth century culture, 152.
- Dunning, William A., councilor A. H. A. (1922), 12, 17; report of com. on rules for George Louis Beer prize (1921), 85.
- Durand, E. Dana, of bd. of research advisers, Univ. Center for Research in Washington, 79, 80.
- Dutcher, George M., chairman bibliography com. (1922), 19, 51, 89; report of bibliography com. (1921), 65-69.
- Dynes, Sarah A., of board of editors, *Hist. Outlook* (1922), 19, 51, 90.
- Early Roman Empire as a Continuation of the Republic* (abstract), Marsh, 141-143.
- Economic history, session (1921), 35; problems, 125-137.
- Economic History, 1865-1909*, Ballagh, 197.
- Economics, Commerce and*, Westerman, 35 (abstract), 237.
- Edmonds, John H., of pub. archives com. (1922), 19, 51, 89.
- Edwards, John H., present at conf. of hist. socs. (1921), 111.
- Edwards, Gov. Ninian, papers, 114.
- Eighteenth century colonial biography, 34, 178.
- Electioneering in the Time of Sir Robert Walpole*, Perkins, 34, 155.
- Ellery, Eloise, of program com. (1922), 17, 50, 89; report of nominations com. (1921), 82-83.
- Emergency of the Problems of the Period out of War and Reconstruction*, Haworth, 39 (abstract), 192-193.
- Endowment, A. H. A. com. on (1922), 20, 51, 90.
- Endowment for A. H. A., 54.
- England, financial relations with colonies, 34, 177.
- English history, luncheon conference (1921), 34, 153-155. *See also* Bibliography of modern English history, A. H. A. com.
- English Legal History, Study of*, Crawford, 34, 155.
- Epaminondas, Theban general, 233.
- Esarey, Logan, of hist. mss. com. (1922), 18, 50, 89.
- Establishment of the Viceroyalty in the New World—a Projection of Spanish Institutions*, Aiton, 34, (abstract), 172-173.
- Établissements de Rouen, Dow, 36-37, 156.
- Europe, after Congress of Vienna, session (1921), 37-38, 159-165.
- European history. *See* Studies in European history
- Executive council of A. H. A., members (1922), 11-12, 17, 52, 82; report (1921), 59-60; minutes of meeting (1921), 85-91; proceedings adopted by correspondence (1921), 91.
- Far East, conference on hist. of the (1921), 35, 167-169.
- Farmers' Alliance, 41, 219, 222.
- Farrand, Max, chairman local com. (1922), 18, 50, 89; initiates conferences on teaching of hist. and social sciences, 73; present at council meeting, 85, 86.
- Fay, Bernard, *Revolutionary Philosophy in France and in the U. S. at the end of the Eighteenth Century* (abstract), 37, 157.
- Fay, Sidney B., councilor A. H. A. (1922), 12, 17, 52, 82; of agenda com. (1922), 17, 91; of finance com. (1922), 17, 91; of bibliog. com. (1922), 19, 51, 89; at meeting of agenda com. (1921), 52, 83; report of bibliog. com. (1921), 60, 65-69, 85, 87; present at council meetings, 85, 87.
- Federal Union of the Churches of Christ, 196.
- Fernald, Prof., Northmen's colony, 241.
- Field of Religious Development*, Christie, 39-40, (abstract), 196.
- Fields for Research in the South after Reconstruction* (abstract), Lonn, 197-198.
- Finance, A. H. A. com. (1922), 17, 91; budget (1923) presented, 90-91.
- Finances, A. H. A., report of treas. (1921), 43, 55-59, 83.
- Fine Arts, Relation to the History of Civilization*, Schevill, 35 (abstract), 232.
- First Constitution of Missouri* (abstract), Lehmann, 185.
- First Indian School of the Pacific Northwest*, Gatke, 102.
- Fish, Carl R., councilor A. H. A. (1922), 12, 17, 52, 82; of meetings and relations com. (1922), 17, 91; of appointments com. (1922), 17, 91; of Brussels hist. cong. com. (1922), 21, 91; present at council meeting, 85, 87.
- Fleming, Walter L., of program com. (1922), 17, 50, 89.
- Fling, Fred M., discussion of hist. teaching, 124; *Significance of the French Revolution*, 37, 157.
- Florence, Italy, 129.
- Ford, Guy S., of board of editors, *Am. Hist. Rev.* (1922), 18; chairman hist. teaching in the schools com. (1922), 20, 51, 90; of audit com. (1921), 49; report of audit com. (1921), 49, 57; advertising in *Am. Hist. Rev.*, 87.
- Ford, Worthington C., councilor A. H. A. (1922), 12, 17; of service com. (1922), 19, 51, 90.
- Foreign archives. *See* Obtaining transcripts from foreign archives, A. H. A. com.
- Fox, Dixon R., chairman hereditary patriotic socs. com. (1922), 19, 33, 51, 89; report of hereditary patriotic socs. com. (1921), 84; present at conf. of hist. socs. (1921), 111; Osgood and Livingston papers, 179.
- France, session on hist. of (1921), 36-37, 153-157; *Part Played in Liberating Other Nations*, Hazen, 37, 157.
- Frank, Tenney, of Brussels hist. cong. com. (1922), 21, 91.
- Frayer, William A., *Criticism of the Italian Settlement of 1816*, 37, (abstract), 161.

- Frederick the Great, 234.  
 French colonial hist. teaching, 179.  
*French Imperialism, British Jealousy of, after 1815*, Moon, 37, 163.  
*French Revolution, Significance of the*, Fling, 157.  
 Fuerderigues, L., present at conf. of hist. socs. (1921), 111.  
 Fuller, George N., chairman handbook of hist. socs. com. (1922), 19; (1921), 64, 110.  
 Fur trade, 114.  
*Fur Trade and the Northwest Boundary, 1783-1818*, Goodwin, 42 (abstract), 200-204.  
*Future of the Public Archives Commission*, 121.  
 Galicia, Republic of, appeal, 83.  
 García, Señor Genaro, library, 34, 170-171.  
 Garfield, James A., papers, 39, 194.  
 Garth, Charles, correspondence, 177.  
 Gatke, Robert M., *First Indian School of the Pacific Northwest*, 102.  
 Gay, E. F., function of commercial city, 131.  
 Genoa, Italy, 129.  
*George III, In re the Am. People vs.*, Alvord, 38-39 (abstract), 182-184.  
 George Louis Beer prize, A. H. A. com. (1922), 20, 51, 90; conditions of award, 23-24, 72-73; rules adopted, 44, 49; spec. com. discharged, 60; report of com. on rules for (1921), 85, 88.  
 Gerould, James T., recommends survey of libraries for hist. collections, 67, 84, 87.  
 Geyer, Henry S., U. S. Senator from Mo. 186.  
 Ghent, treaty of, 203-204.  
 Gillespie, James E., discussion of sociology, 136-137.  
 Gipson, Prof., eighteenth-century colonial biography, 34, 178.  
*Glossarium*, Du Cange, 151; revision, 88.  
 Godard, George S., paper discussed, 32; presides at conf. of hist. socs., 109; present at conf. of hist. socs. (1921), 111.  
 Golder, Frank A., copies of Bermont documents, 98.  
 Goodwin, Cardinal, *Fur Trade and the Northwest Boundary, 1783-1818*, 42, (abstract), 200-204.  
 Gras, N. S. B., *Development of Metropolitan Economy in Europe and America*, 35, (abstract), 127-132.  
 Great American Desert, 187-188.  
 Great Britain, Public Record Office, 115.  
 Great War. See World War.  
 Greely, John N., *What Happens in Battle*, 70.  
 Greene, Everts B., chairman program com. (1921), 31.  
 Griffin, A. P. C., of bibliog. of hist. socs. com. (1922), 18, (1921), 64.  
 Griffin, Grace G., *Writings on Am. Hist.*, 62.  
 Griffin, L., two-yr. course in world hist., 106.  
 Grignon papers, 114.  
*Growth of Industries in Louisiana, 1699-1763*, Surrey, 42, 109.  
 Guérard, Albert F., *Voltaire's Philosophy of History*, 37, (abstract), 157.  
*Guide to Historical Literature*, 60, 66-67; report of bibliog. com. on (1921), 87.  
*Guido Bonatti, an Astrologer of the Thirteenth Century Mentioned by Dante*, Thorndike, 36, (abstract), 147-148.  
 Hackett, Charles W., *Materials for Spanish Hist. in the Genaro Garcia Library at the Univ. of Texas*, 34, (abstract), 170-171.  
 Hall, Frederic A., address of welcome, 30.  
 Hammond, George, letter to Lord Grenville, 200.  
 Handbook of historical societies, conf. of hist. socs. com. on (1922), 19; (1921), 64, 65; report (1921), 110.  
 Hannibal, in Italy, 234.  
 Harford, Crystal, councillor, P. C. B. (1922), 13, 103.  
 Hailan, E. R., present at conf. of hist. socs. (1921), 111.  
 Harrowby, Lord, in British Foreign Office, 202.  
 Hart, Albert B., councillor A. H. A. (1922), 11, 17; of com. on plan for university center, 75.  
 Hartsough, Mildred E., discussion of metropolitan economy, 131-132.  
 Haskins, Charles H., pres. A. H. A. (1922), 11, 16, 44, 52, 82, chairman agenda com. (1922), 17, 91; chairman appointments com. (1922), 17, 91; delegate to Am. council of learned socs., 17, 51, 60, 88, 90; research in hist. of science, 33, 241; 1st vice pres. A. H. A. (1921), 43; at meeting of agenda com. (1921), 52, 83; present at council meetings, 85, 87, 88; report for Am. council of learned socs. (1921), 88.  
 Hawkesbury, Lord, in British Foreign Office, 202.  
 Haworth, Paul L., *Emergency of the Problems of the Period out of War and Reconstruction*, 39, (abstract), 192-192.  
 Hay, Thomas R., of military hist. com. (1922), 19, 51, 89; *Campaign and Battle of Spring Hill*, 70.  
 Hayes, Carlton, J. H., councillor A. H. A. (1922), 12, 17, 52, 82; of agenda com. (1922), 17, 91; of appointments com. (1922), 17, 91; at meeting of agenda com. (1921), 52, 83; report of subcom. to study and report on the proposal to establish a com. on research (1921), 71-72, 84, 87; present at council meeting, 85, 87, 88; discussion of liberalism, 165.  
 Hazen, Charles D., *Part France Has Played in Liberating Other Nations*, 37, 157.  
 Herbert Baxter Adams prize, A. H. A. com. (1922), 18, 50, 89; conditions of award, 23; list of awards, 24-25, 44, 50; report (1921), 50, 62, 83; limit on printing, 85, 88.  
 Hereditary patriotic societies, A. H. A. com. (1922), 19, 51, 89.  
 Herron, Stella, of service com. (1922), 19, 51, 90.  
 Hill, David J., of bd. of research advisers, Univ. Center for Research in Washington, 79, 80.  
 Hill, Joseph A., of Univ. Center for Research in Washington, 79; of bd. of research advisers, Univ. Center for Research in Washington, 79.  
 Himes, George II., curator of Or. Hist. Assn., 102.  
 Hispanic-American history, luncheon conf. on (1921), 34-35, 167, 170-174.  
*Historical Archives, How Can the States be Persuaded to Take Care of Their*, 121.  
 Historical congress at Rio de Janeiro, A. H. A. com. on (1922), 20, 51, 90.  
 Historical manuscripts commission, members (1922), 18, 50, 89; report (1921), 73, 86.  
 Historical materials in American libraries, check list proposed, 67, 84, 87.  
*Historical Materials in the Depositories of the Middle West*, Penso, 109, (abstract) 114-117.  
*Historical Outlook*, board of editors (1922), 19, 51, 90; report (1921), 83.  
 Historical research in colleges, A. H. A. com. (1922), 20, 51, 90; recommended, 71.

- Historical societies, com. on bibliog. of (1922), 18; report (1921), 110. *See also* Conference of historical societies.—Handbook of historical socs., conf of hist. socs. com. on.
- History of civilization, 227-237.
- History teaching in the schools, A. H. A. com (1922), 20, 51, 90; to cooperate with Natl. Council of Teachers of Social Studies, 59, 86; report (1921), 73-74, 85, 86; conference on, resolution on college entrance examinations, 88; conference on (1921), 119-124
- History tendencies, 155
- Hittite documents, 230.
- Hockett, Homer C., of bibliog. of Am travel sub-com. (1922), 19, 51, 89.
- Hodder, F. H., report of nominations com. (1921), 82-83.
- Holman, Frederick V., pres. Oregon Hist. Soc., 105.
- Holy Alliance, 174.
- Hoover War Library, *Manuscripts on Eastern Europe in the Lutz*, 97.
- House, Robert Burton, of pub. archives comm. (1922), 19, 51, 89
- How Can the States be Persuaded to Take Care of Their Historical Archives*, 121.
- Howland, Charles R., *Causes of the World War*, 38, (abstract), 212-213.
- Hudson Bay Co. and Early Oregon History*, Clark, 104.
- Hulbert, Archer B., natural sciences aid study of Am. hist., 34; *Soil Factor in Pa. and Va. Colonization*, 40, (abstract), 224-225, present at conf. of hist. socs. (1921), 111; *American Hist. and the Natural Sciences* (abstract), 241-242.
- Hunt, Gaillard, of hist. mss. comm. (1922), 18, 50, 89; of natl. archives com. (1922), 19, 51, 89; of com. on obtaining transcripts from foreign archives (1922), 19, 51, 89; of university center in Washington com. (1922), 20, 91; of com. on plan for university center, 75; vice chairman div. of hist., Univ. Center for Research in Washington, 77, 80; of Univ. Center for Research in Washington, 79, of bd. of research advisers, Univ. Center for Research in Washington, 79.
- Hyde, Chas. C., of Univ. Center for Research in Washington, 79, 80; of bd. of research advisers, Univ. Center for Research in Washington, 79.
- In re the Amer. People v. George III*, Alvord, 38-39, (abstract), 182-184.
- Indians, correspondence and records, 112.
- Influence of Agricultural Conditions upon Louisiana State Politics During the Nineties*, White, 41, (abstract), 222
- Influence of the Movements of Population on Missouri Hist. before the Civil War*, Lynch, 42, (abstract), 190-191.
- Inglish, Ellis & Co., 203.
- Institute for Government Research, 77.
- International Congress of Historical Studies, revival suggested, 84, 87.
- International State of the Middle Ages, Some Reasons for Its Failure*, Krey, 36, (abstract), 149-150
- Iowa, Lessons from*, Stiles, 121.
- Irby, Louise, discussion of hist. teaching, 123.
- Irving, Washington, *Astoria*, 187.
- Italian Settlement of 1815, Criticism of the*, Frayer, 37, (abstract), 161.
- Jameson, John F., counselor A. H. A. (1922), 11, 17; delegate to Am. council of learned socs., 17; managing editor, board of editors, *Am. Hist. Rev.* (1922), 18; of publications com. (1922), 18, 50, 89; chairman natl. archives com. (1922), 19, 51, 89; chairman service com. (1922), 19, 51, 90; chairman university center in Washington com. (1922), 20, 91; chairman doc. hist. publs. of U. S. com. (1922), 21, 51, 90, chairman Brussels hist. cong. com. (1922), 21, 91; to prepare memorial in regard to archives bldg., 60, chairman div. of hist., Univ. Center for Research in Washington, 77, 80; of Univ. Center for Research in Washington, 79, 80; of bd. of research advisers, Univ. Center for Research in Washington, 79; report of natl. archives com. (1921), 84; report of doc. hist. publs. com. (1921), 84; report of obtaining transcripts from foreign archives com. (1921), 84; report of service com. (1921), 84; report of bd. of editors, *Am. Hist. Rev.* (1921), 85; present at council meetings, 85, 87, 88; memorial respecting archives bldg., 86.
- Jay, John, Northwest boundary, 201.
- Jay's Treaty and the Northwest Boundary Gap*, Bemis, 101-102.
- Jernegan, M. W., increase in knowledge of Amer colonies, 178-179.
- Jervey, Theodore D., of service com. (1922), 19, 51, 90.
- John, *king of England*, 98-99
- Johnson, Henry, of hist. teaching in the schools com. (1922), 20, 51, 90; representative in Natl. Council of Teachers of Social Studies (1922), 20, 32, 51, 90, report of hist. teaching in the schools com. (1921), 73-74, 85.
- Joranson, Einar, Herbert Baxter Adams prize awarded to, 44, 50, 62
- Journal of European history, A. H. A. spec. com., report (1921), 60
- Judson, Miss, letters of John McLaughlin, 104.
- July Days and After*, Allison, 37, 38, (abstract), 163-164.
- Jusserand, Jean J., counselor A. H. A. (1922), 12, 17, chairman writing of hist. com. (1922), 21, 51, 90; writing of hist. com. continued, 84.
- Justin Winsor prize, A. H. A. com. (1922), 18, 50, 89; conditions of award, 23; list of awards, 24, 44, 50; report (1920), 50.
- Kadesh, Syria, 230
- Kane, Elias K., papers, 114.
- Kansas, slavery struggle, 190-191.
- Kellar, Herbert A., of publications com. (1922), 18, 50, 89; present at conf. of hist. socs. (1921), 111.
- Kellogg, Louise P., of service com. (1922), 19, 51, 90.
- Kellogg, Vernon L., of bd. of research advisers, Univ. Center for Research in Washington, 79, 80.
- Kendrick, Benjamin B., of hist. research in colleges com. (1922), 20, 51, 90.
- Kentucky, archives, 117; blue grass region, 224-225.
- Kentucky, State Historical Society of, 117.
- Kerner, Robert J., *Nationalism and the Metemich System*, 37, (abstract), 162-163.
- Khatti, Asia Minor, 230.
- Klein, Julius, of hist. congress at Rio de Janeiro spec. com. (1922), 20, 51, 90, of div. of hist., Univ. Center for Research in Washington, 78, 80; of Univ. Center for Research in Washington, 79; of bd. of research advisers, Univ. Center for Research in Washington, 79.

- Knights of Columbus, prizes for studies in Am. hist., 83.
- Knowlton, Daniel C., of board of editors, *Hist. Outlook* (1922), 19, 51, 90; of hist. teaching in the schools com. (1922), 20, 51, 90.
- Koehn, George L., chairman P. C. B. arrangements com. (1921), 97.
- Kohlmeier, Albert L., *Commerce and Union Sentiment in the Old Northwest in 1880*, 42, (abstract), 205; discussion, 219.
- Korff, Baron Serge, of bd. of research adviser; Univ. Center for Research in Washington, 79, 80.
- Krey, A. C., of membership com. (1922), 18, 50, 89.
- International State of the Middle Ages, Some Reasons for its Failure*, 36, (abstract), 149-150.
- Kuntz, Olive, councillor P. C. B. (1922), 13, 103; of P. C. B. arrangements com. (1921), 97; paper on Tiberius Caesar, 99.
- Lakes of Oregon*, McArthur, 104.
- Lancaster Co., Pa., 40, 224, 242.
- Lanza, Conrad H., *Thirty-fifth Division on Sept. 29, 1918*, 38, (abstract) 214-216.
- Larson, Laurence M., of board of editors, *Hist. Outlook*, (1922), 19, 51, 90; resolution on revision of Du Cange's *Glossarium*, 88.
- Latin, of Middle Ages, 151-152.
- Latvian manuscripts, 97-98.
- Laut, Miss, Hudson Bay Co. hist., 104.
- Learned, H. Barrett, letter of transmittal ann rept., 5; chairman publications com. (1922), 18, 50, 89; of university center in Washington com. (1922), 20, 91; *Sidelight on the Repeal of the Mo. Compromise*, 41, (abstract) 189; report of publications com. (1921), 50, 60, 62-64, 85, 88; of div. of hist., University Center of Research in Washington, 78, 80; of Univ. Center for Research in Washington, 79; of bd. of research advisers, Univ. Center for Research in Washington, 79; present at council meeting, 88; printing Herbert Baxter Adams prize essay, 88-89.
- Lee, Joseph D., account of Indian mission school pupil, 102; hist. of Oregon, 105.
- Lee, Richard H., offer to investigate doubtful publications, 60, 83, 85.
- Lee, Robert E., strategy, 234-235.
- Lehman, Frederick W., Mo. State constitution of 1820, 41; *First Constitution of Mo.* (abstract), 185.
- Leland, Waldo G., of pub. archives com. (1922), 19, 51, 89; of com. on obtaining transcripts from foreign archives (1922), 19, 51, 89; of university center in Washington com. (1922), 20, 91; of Brussels hist. cong. com. (1922), 21, 91; report of com. on disposition of records (1921), 61, 84, 87; report of com. on railroad rates (1921), 61-62, 84; report of com. on university center in Washington (1921), 74-82, 85; of div. of hist., University Center for Research in Washington, 78, 80; of Univ. Center for Research in Washington, 79; of bd. of research advisers, Univ. Center for Research in Washington, 79.
- Lessons from Iowa*, Stiles, 121.
- Liber Astronomicus*, Bonatti, 147.
- Life-membership fees, A. H. A., increase, 43, 49.
- Light on the Period from the Garfield Papers*, Smith, 39, (abstract) 194.
- Limitations of the Ancient Book*, Scholz, 99-100.
- Lincoln, Abraham, Mo. vote for, 191.
- Lincoln, Natalie S., of hereditary patriotic socs. com. (1922), 19, 51, 89.
- Lingelbach, William E., of nominations com. (1922), 17, 44, 52, 82; report of nominations com. (1921), 82-83.
- Liverpool, England, 130.
- Livingston papers, 179.
- Local com. of A. H. A. (1922), 18, 50, 89; (1921), 31; vote of thanks to, 52, 88; to appoint com. on publicity, 83.
- London, England, metropolitan growth, 129-130.
- Long, Stephen H., report, 187.
- Lonn, Ella, questions in hist. of South, 40; *Fields for Research in the South after Reconstruction* (abstract), 197-198.
- Lord, Robert H., of George L. Beer prize com. (1922), 20, 51, 90; of board of editors, Studies in European hist. (1922), 20, 91.
- Lorenz, M. O., of bd. of research advisers, Univ. Center for Research in Washington, 79, 80.
- Louis Philippe, 164.
- Louisiana, *Influence of Agric. Conditions upon State Politics During the Nineties*, White, 41, (abstract) 222; *Growth of Industries, 1699-1763*, Surrey, 42, (abstract) 190; withdrawal of Federal troops, 193.
- Lucas, Gov., papers, 114.
- Lucas, Henry S., councillor P. C. B. (1922), 13, 103; chairman P. C. B. auditing com. report (1921), 103.
- Lumbermen, 114.
- Lutz, Ralph H., *Manuscripts on Eastern Europe in the Hoover War Library*, 97; of P. C. B. resolutions com. (1921), 102.
- Luzerne's press, 37.
- Lynch, William O., *Influence of the Movements of Population on Missouri Hist. before the Civil War*, 42, (abstract) 190-191.
- McArthur, Duncan, papers, 113.
- McArthur, Lewis A., *Lakes of Oregon*, 104.
- McCormac, Eugene L., vice pres. P. C. B. (1922), 13, 103.
- MacDonald, Arthur, all scientific bureaus under Smithsonian Institution, 83.
- McGuire, Constantine E., of hist. congress at Rio de Janeiro spec. com. (1922), 20, 51, 90.
- Mellwain, Charles H., of Herbert Baxter Adams prize com. (1922), 18, 50, 89.
- McKinley, Albert E., of service com. (1922), 19, 51, 90; managing editor, board of editors, *Hist. Outlook* (1922), 19; of hist. teaching in the schools com. (1922), 20, 51, 90.
- McKinley, Charles, of P. C. B. arrangements com. (1921), 97.
- Mackoy, Harry B., of hereditary patriotic socs. com. (1922), 19, 51, 89.
- McLaughlin, Andrew C., councillor A. H. A. (1922), 12, 17; discussion, 38; present at council meeting, 87; discussion of Am. Revolution, 182-183.
- McLaughlin, John, letters, 104-105.
- McMahon, Edward, of P. C. B. program com. (1921), 97.
- McMaster, John B., councillor A. H. A. (1922), 11, 17.
- Macmillan Co., price of *Am. Hist. Rev.*, 85.
- McTavish, Simon, agent of North West Co., 201.
- McTavish, Fraser & Co., 203.
- Magna Carta, 98.

- Mahan, Bruce E., present at conf. of hist. socs. (1921), 111.
- Malcom, Roy, of P. C. B. program com. (1921), 97.
- Manchester, England, 130.
- Manifestations of Party Life in the British North American Colonies*, Robinson, 100.
- Manual of Historical Literature*, Adams, 65-66.
- Manuscripts on Eastern Europe in the Hoover War Library*, Lutz, 97.
- Marsh, Mrs. Eugene, present at conf. of hist. socs. (1921), 111.
- Marsh, Frank B., paper on Roman Empire, 36; *Early Roman Empire as a Continuation of the Republic* (abstract), 141-143.
- Marshall, Thomas M., of local com. (1921), 31.
- Martin, Asa E., of hist. research in colleges com. (1922), 20, 51, 90.
- Martin, Percy A., vice chairman hist. congress at Rio de Janeiro spec. com. (1922), 20, 51, 90; of P. C. B. program com. (1921), 97; *South America, its History and its Historians*, 100-101, 102; chairman P. C. B. nominations com. report (1921), 103; invitation to P. C. B., 104; address, 105.
- Material in Washington of Value to the States*, Mereness, 109, (abstract), 112-113.
- Materials for Spanish Hist. in the Genaro Garcia Library at the Univ. of Texas*, 34, (abstract) 170-171.
- Medieval history, session (1921), 36, 145-152; resolution on revision of Du Cange's *Glossarium*, 83.
- Meetings and relations, A. H. A. com. (1922), 17, 91.
- Melvin, Frank E., of membership com. (1922), 18, 50, 89.
- Membership, A. H. A. com. (1922), 18, 50-51, 89.
- Mendoza, Antonio de, viceroy, 172-173.
- Mereness, Newton D., paper, 32; *Material in Washington of Value to the States*, 109, abstract, 112-113; present at conf. of hist. socs. (1921), 111; calendar of archives at Washington relative to western States, 115.
- Meriam, Lewis, of bd. of research advisers, Univ. Center for Research in Washington, 79, 80.
- Merriman, Roger B., of bibliog. of mod. English hist. spec. com. (1922), 20, 51, 90.
- Metropolitan Economy in Europe and America*, Gras, 35, (abstract), 127-132.
- Metternich System, Nationalism and the*, Kornor, 37, (abstract), 162-163.
- Mexicana collection, 170-171.
- Meyer, Balthasar H., of Univ. Center for Research in Washington, 79, 80; of bd. of research advisers, Univ. Center for Research in Washington, 79.
- Michillimackinac Co., 203.
- Middle Ages, International State of the, Some Reasons for its Failure*, Krey, 36, (abstract), 149-150.
- Military history, A. H. A. com. (1922), 19, 51, 89; session on (1921), 38; report (1921), 69-70, 88.
- Miller, Adolph C., of bd. of research advisers, Univ. Center for Research in Washington, 79, 80.
- Mississippi Valley, calendar of Parisian archives rel. to, 64.
- Mississippi Valley Historical Association, joint session with A. H. A. (1921), 30, 42.
- Mississippi Valley in British Politics*, Alvord, 180.
- Missouri, State constitution of 1820, 41; traditions and paradoxes, 41; *First Constitution* of (abstract), Lehmann, 185; *Influence of the Movements of Population on Mo. Hist.*, Lynch, 42, (abstract), 190-191.
- Missouri Botanical Garden, dinner to A. H. A., 30; A. H. A. vote of thanks to, 52, 88.
- Missouri Compromise, Sidelight on the Repeal of the*, Learned, 41, (abstract), 189.
- Missouri Historical Society, joint session with A. H. A. (1921), 30; A. H. A. vote of thanks to trustees, 52, 88.
- Missouri history, session (1921), 41-42.
- Missouri Question, Traditions Concerning the*, Shoemaker, 41 (abstract), 186-188.
- Mittel Europa, 212-213.
- Modern European history; Europe after the Congress of Vienna, 159-165.
- Monroe, James, minister extraordinary, 202.
- Moon, Parker T., *British Jealousy of French Imperialism after 1815*, 37, 163.
- Moore, Charles, treas. A. H. A. (1922), 11, 16, 44, 52, 82; of agenda com. (1922), 17, 91; chairman finance com. (1922), 17, 91; of natl. archives com. (1922), 19, 51, 89; chairman endowment com. (1922), 20, 51, 90; of university center in Washington com. (1922), 20, 91; of doc. hist. publs. of the U. S. com. (1922), 21, 51, 90; at meeting of agenda com. (1921), 52, 83; report as treas. (1921), 55-57, 85; of div. of hist., University Center for Research in Washington, 78, 80; of Univ. Center for Research in Washington, 79; of bd. of research advisers, Univ. Center for Research in Washington, 80; present at council meetings, 85, 87, 88.
- Moran, Thomas F., of Justin Winsor prize com. (1922), 18, 50, 89.
- Morgan, Edwin V., of hist. congress at Rio de Janeiro spec. com. (1922), 20, 51, 90.
- Morison, Samuel E., discussion of Am. Revolution, 38, 184.
- Mormon People, Settlement of the Great Basin by the*, Young, 100.
- Morris, William A., sec.-treas. P. C. B. (1922), 13, 103; paper on King John, the sheriffs and Magna Carta, 98.
- Munro, D. C., report of spec. com. on journal of European hist. (1921), 60; report of spec. com. on university center in Washington (1921), 60, 74-82, 87; project for studies in European hist., 85; present at council meetings, 85, 87; report on Natl. Council of Teachers of Social Studies, 86; report of spec. com. on publi. of studies in European hist. (1921), 87.
- Muzzey, David S., chairman program com. (1922), 17, 50, 89.
- Napoleon Bonaparte, strategy, 234.
- National archives, A. H. A. com. (1922), 10, 51, 89; report (1921), 84.
- National archives, conf. of hist. socs. com. (1922), 110; resolutions, 110-111.
- National Council of Teachers of Social Studies, A. H. A. representatives in (1922), 20, 51, 59, 90; efforts at solution of problems, 32, 105; report on (1921), 86; delegates to, 88.
- National Research Council, 75-76.
- Nationalism and the Metternich System*, Kerner, 37, (abstract) 162-163.
- Natural Sciences, American Hist. and the* (abstract), Hulbert, 241-242.
- Negro problem, 192, 193, 223.
- Neilson, Nellie, of nominations com. (1922), 17, 44, 52, 82; of Herbert Baxter Adams prize com. (1922), 18, 50, 89.

- New Evidence from the Papyri*, Oldfather, 36; (abstract) 144.
- New Haven Colony Historical Society, invitation to A. H. A., 60, 84.
- New Light on the Origins of Civilization*, Breasted, 35, (abstract) 229-231.
- New York, N. Y., metropolitan rivalry, 130.
- Newhall, Richard A., of membership com. (1922), 18, 50, 89.
- Newspapers, application of principles of hist. criticism to, 39; use of, 195.
- Nisqually Post, Journal, 104.
- Nolcombe, A. N., of Am. Political Science Assn. com. on university center in Washington (1921), 75.
- Nominations, A. H. A. com. (1922), 17, 44, 52, 82; amdt. to constitution, 49-50; report (1921), 52, 82-83.
- Nominations, P. C. B. com., report (1921), 103.
- North Carolina, *Agric. Reconstruction after the Civil War*, Carson, 40, (abstract) 223.
- Northmen's colony, 241.
- Northwest Boundary, Fur Trade and the, 1785-1818*, Goodwin, 42, (abstract) 200-204.
- Northwest Boundary Gap, Jay's Treaty and the*, Bemis, 101-102.
- North West Co., 201.
- Notestein, Wallace, of board of editors, *Studies in European hist.* (1922), 20, 91; of bibliog. of mod. English hist. spec. com. (1922), 20, 51, 90.
- Nussbaum, Frederick L., prize essay to be printed, 60.
- Obtaining transcripts from foreign archives, A. H. A. com. (1922), 19, 51, 89; report (1921), 84.
- Oklahoma, cattle ranching, 41.
- Old Northwest, Commerce and Union sentiment*, Kohlmeir, 42, (abstract) 205.
- Oldfather, Charles H., *New Evidence from the Papyri*, 36, (abstract) 144.
- Oliveira Lima, Manoel de, of hist. congress at Rio de Janeiro spec. com. (1922), 20, 51, 90.
- Oliver, John W., of membership com. (1922), 18, 50, 89; present at conf. of hist. socs. (1921), 111.
- Olsen, Nils Andreas, of program com. (1922), 17, 50, 89.
- Oregon Historical Society, joint meeting with Pacific Coast Branch, 97, 104.
- Oregon, Lakes of*, McArthur, 104.
- Orient, research in, 229-230.
- Oriental Institute. See Chicago, Univ. of.
- Outline of History*, Wells, 232.
- Pacific Coast Branch, officers elected for 1922, 13; oral report (1921), 44, 90; PROCEEDINGS OF SEVENTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING (1921), 95-106.
- Pacific Northwest, First Indian School of the*, Gatke, 102.
- Packard, Lawrence B., discussion of Metternich, 165.
- Paetow, Louis J., of Herbert Baxter Adams prize com. (1922), 18, 50, 89; *Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries in the Hist. of Culture*, 36, (abstract) 151-152; of P. C. B. program conf. (1921), 97.
- Page, Edward C., present at conf. of hist. socs. (1921), 111.
- Page, Thomas W., of bd. of research advisers, Univ. Center for Research in Washington, 80.
- Paltsits, Victor H., chairman conference of hist. socs. (1922), 18, 32, 111; chairman pub. archives com. (1922), 19, 32, 51, 89 of conf. of hist. socs. natl. archives bldg. com. (1922), 110; present at conf. of hist. socs. (1921), 111; discussion, 116.
- Papyri, New Evidence from the*, Oldfather, 36; (abstract), 144.
- Paris, France, 130.
- Parish, John C., of program com. (1922), 18, 51, 89; of conf. of hist. socs. (1922), 18, 50, 89; of handbook of hist. socs. com. (1922), 18, (1921), 64; report of conf. of hist. socs. (1921), 64-65, 109; sec. of conf. of hist. socs. (1921), 109, 111; present at conf. of hist. socs. (1921), 111.
- Part France Has Played in Liberating Other Nations*, Hazen, 37, 157.
- Patriotic societies. See Hereditary patriotic societies, A. H. A. com.
- Paxson, Frederic L., councillor A. H. A. (1922), 12, 17, 52, 82; of agenda com. (1922), 17, 91; of finance com. (1922), 17, 91; of com. to coop. with Peoples of Am. Soc. (1922), 21, 51, 84, 90; at meeting of agenda com. (1921), 52, 83; present at council meeting, 85, 87, 88; discussion of hist. teaching, 124.
- Peace of God, 149-150.
- Pease, Theodore C., paper, 32; *Historical Materials in the Depositories of the Middle West*, 109, (abstract), 114-117; present at conf. of hist. socs. (1921), 111.
- Pelzer, Louis, discussion, 199.
- Penn, William, plan for league of European states, 212.
- Pennsylvania, *Soil Factor in Colonization*. Hulbert, 40, (abstract), 224-225, 242.
- Peoples of America Society, A. H. A. spec. com. to cooperate with (1922), 21, 51, 84, 90; report of sub-com. of com. on agenda on (1921), 87.
- People's Party, 41, 222.
- Periodicals, application of principles of hist. criticism to, 39; use of, 195.
- Perkins, Clarence, *Electioneering in the time of Sir Robert Walpole*, 34, 155.
- Pettus, Charles P., of local com. (1921), 81.
- Phalanx, 233.
- Philadelphia, Pa., metropolitan rivalry, 130.
- Phillips, Philip, papers, 41, 189.
- Philosophy of History*, Voltaire's, Guérard, 37, (abstract) 157.
- Pierce, Bessie L., discussion of hist. teaching, 122-123.
- Pike, Zebulon M., report of 1810, 187.
- Pinckney, ———, minister extraordinary, 202.
- Pittsburgh, Pa., metropolitan rivalry, 130.
- Planters Hotel, vote of thanks to, 88.
- Plez, Juan, diary, 173.
- Poindexter, Sen., resolutions on natl. archives bldg. sent to, 110.
- Policy, A. H. A. com., check list of hist. materials in Am. libraries, 84.
- Policy of Spain toward her Revolted Colonies in 1823-1824* (abstract), Robertson, 174.
- Porlier papers, 114.
- Present Day Thoughts on the American Revolution*, Andrews, 181.
- Preston, William, surveyor, 225.
- Priestley, Herbert I., of service com. (1922), 19, 51, 90.

- Primary ballot, A. H. A., by-law interpretation, 43, 50.
- Prince Shotoku and the Taikwa Reform in Japan*, Warner, 35, 169.
- Problems of economic history, 125-137.
- Program, P. C. B. com. (1921), 97.
- Program of annual meeting, com. See Annual Meeting of A. H. A., program com.
- Prussia, military training, 235.
- Public archives commission, members (1922), 19, 51, 89; report (1921), 83; future of, 121.
- Publication fund. See Endowment for A. H. A.
- Publications, A. H. A. com. (1922), 18, 50, 89; report (1921), 50, 60, 62-64, 85, 88.
- Putnam, Eben, of natl. archives com. (1922) 19, 51, 89; of military hist. com. (1922), 19, 51, 89.
- Putnam, Herbert, of div. of hist., University Center for Research in Washington, 78; of Univ. Center for Research in Washington, 79; of bd. of research advisers, Univ. Center for Research in Washington, 80.
- Putnam, Ruth, councillor A. H. A. (1922), 12, 17, 52, 82; of meetings and relations com. (1922), 17, 91.
- Quaife, Milo M., chairman bibliog. of Am. travel subcom. (1922), 19, 51, 89; present at conf. of hist. socs. (1921), 111; archives of Bur. of Indian Affairs, 116.
- Railroad rates, reduction (1921), 31; A. H. A. spec. com. (1921) discharged, 60, report (1921), 61-62 84.
- Ramsdell, Charles W., of membership com. (1922), 18, 51, 89; discussion of economic hist. of South, 198-199, 222.
- Rank, Mr., flag of Hudson Bay Co., 105.
- Read, Conyers, chairman Herbert Baxter Adams prize com. (19 22), 18, 50, 89; of bibliog. of mod. English hist. spec. com. (1922), 90, 51, 90; complaint relative to nonprinting of essays, 54; report of Herbert Baxter Adams prize com. (1921), 62.
- Recent Advances in Our Knowledge of the Roman Empire*, Boak, 36, (abstract) 141.
- Recent History Tendencies and a Suggestion* (abstract), Cross, 155.
- Reconstruction, discussion of problems, 39, 192-193; *Fields for Research in the South after* (abstract), Lonn, 197-198.
- Records. See Disposition of records, A. H. A. com. on.
- Reeves, Jesse S., of George L. Beer prize com (1922), 20, 51, 90.
- Reinsch, Paul S., of Univ. Center for Research in Washington, 79, 80; of bd. of research advisers, Univ. Center for Research in Washington, *Relation of Sociology to Social and Economic History* (abstract), Barnes, 132-137.
- Relation of the Fine Arts to the History of Civilization*, Schevill, 35, (abstract) 232.
- Republican Party, Scandinavian element in, 41, 219.
- Research, A. H. A. com. on, created, 60; suggested, 84.
- Research A. H. A. subcom. to study and report on the proposal to establish a com. on, report (1921), 71-72, 84, 87.
- Resolutions, P. C. B. com. (1921), report, 102-103.
- Revolutionary Philosophy in France and in the U. S. at the End of the Eighteenth Century* (abstract), Faÿ, 37, 157.
- Revolutionary war, muster rolls, 113.
- Reynolds, Dorrance, *Apremont*, 70.
- Rhodes, James F., councillor A. H. A. (1922), 11, 17.
- Rice, Richard A., of div. of hist., University Center for Research in Washington, 78, 80; of Univ. Center for Research in Washington, 79, 80.
- Richardson, Oliver H., chairman, report of P. C. B. resolutions com. (1921), 102-103; address, 105.
- Rio de Janeiro. See Historical congress.
- Rippy, J. Fred, discussion sociology, 134-135
- Rise of the New South*, Bruce, 197.
- Robertson, Prof., policy of Spain toward revolted colonies, 35.
- Robertson, James A., sec. hist. congress at Rio de Janeiro spec. com. (1922), 20, 51, 90.
- Robertson, William S., *Policy of Spain toward Her Revolted Colonies in 1823-1824* (abstract), 174.
- Robinson, Edgar E., *Manifestations of Party Life in the British North American Colonies*, 100.
- Robinson, Morgan P., invitation to A. H. A. to meet in Richmond, 87; of conf. of hist. socs. natl. archives bldg. com. (1922), 110; present at conf. of hist. socs (1921), 111
- Rockefeller, John D., Oriental Institute, 231
- Rogers, John J., of bd. of research advisers, Univ. Center for Research in Washington, 80.
- Roman Empire, session on hist. of (1921), 36; *Recent Advances in Our Knowledge of the Roman Empire*, 141; *Early Roman Empire as a Continuation of the Republic*, 141-143.
- Roman legion, 233.
- Root, W. T., discussion of financial relations between England and the colonies, 34, 177.
- Rostovtzeff, Prof., influence of art of Central Asia on South Russia and China, 35, 169.
- Rouen, Town Privileges under the Establishments of*, Dow, 36-37, (abstract) 156.
- Rowe, Leo S., of Am. Political Science Assn. com. on univ. center in Washington (1921), 75; pres. bd. of research advisers, Univ. Center for Research in Washington, 79, 80.
- Rowland, Dunbar, report (1921) of conf. of hist. socs. com. on coop. of hist. depts. and socs., 64.
- St. Lawrence River, 241.
- Saint Louis Club, vote of thanks to, 88.
- St. Louis Convention, Publicity and Tourists Bureau, vote of thanks to, 88.
- Sanitary Commission, 196.
- Savage, H. H., discussion, 106.
- Scandinavian Element and Agrarian Discontent*, Blegen, 40-41, (abstract) 219.
- Schafer, Joseph, chairman bibliog. of hist. socs. com. (1922), 18, (1921), 64; *Wis. Domesday Book in Agric. Hist.*, 40, (abstract) 220-221; conservation of hist. war material, 88; report of conf. of hist. socs. bibliog. of hist. socs. com. (1921), 110; present, at conf. of hist. socs. (1921), 111.
- Schovill, Ferdinand, *Relation of the Fine Arts to the History of Civilization*, 35, (abstract) 232.
- Schlesinger, Arthur M., of hist. teaching in the schools com. (1922), 20, 51, 90; representative in Natl. Council of Teachers of Social Studies (1922), 20, 32, 51, 90; discussion, 38, 39; discussion of Am. Revolution, 183-184.

- Schmitt, Bernadotte E., of Herbert Baxter Adams prize com. (1922), 18, 50, 89; chairman George L. Beer prize com. (1922), 20, 51, 90; discussion of Congress at Vienna, 165.
- Schmoller, —, mercantilism and natl. economy, 128
- Scholz, Richard F., method of criticism, 99; *Limitations of the Ancient Book*, 99-100; report of P. C. B. nominations com. (1921), 103; presides at P. C. B. annual dinner (1921), 104.
- Schurz, William S., of hist. congress at Rio de Janeiro spec. com. (1922), 20, 51, 90.
- Schwarztrauber, E. E., new course of study in hist., 105.
- Science, luncheon conf. on hist. of (1921), 33-34, 239-242.
- Scott, Arthur P., of membership com. (1922), 18, 51, 89.
- Scott, James B., of Univ. Center for Research in Washington, 79, 80, of bd. of research advisers Univ. Center for Research in Washington, 80
- Service, A. H. A. com. (1922), 19, 51, 90; report (1921), 84.
- Settlement of the Great Basin by the Mormon People*, Young, 100.
- Severance, Frank H., present at conf. of hist. socs. (1921), 111.
- Seymour, Charles, of program com. (1922), 17, 50, 89.
- Shearer, Augustus H., of bibliog. com. (1922), 19, 51, 89; report of bibliog. com. (1921), 65-69
- Sheldon, H. D., training in social science subjects, 105
- Shepard, Cyrus, Indian school worker, 102.
- Sheriffs, King John's, 98-99.
- Shipkoff, Theodore, memoir, 98.
- Shipman, Henry R., of bibliog. com. (1922), 19, 51, 89; report of bibliog. com. (1921), 65-69; discussion of Europe after the Congress of Vienna, 164-165.
- Shoemaker, Floyd C., *Traditions Concerning the Missouri Question*, 41, (abstract) 186-188.
- Shotoku, Prince, and the Taikwa Reform in Japan*, Warner, 35, 169.
- Shotwell, James T., councillor A. H. A. (1922), 12, 17, 52, 82; of meetings and relations com. (1922), 17, 91; of Brussels hist. com. (1922), 21, 91.
- Sidelight on the Repeal of the Mo. Compromise*, Learned, 41, (abstract), 189.
- Siebert, Wilbur H., of program com. (1922), 17, 50, 89; of Herbert Baxter Adams prize com. (1922), 18, 50, 89.
- Significance of Sociology for Economic and Social History*, Barnes, 35-36.
- Significance of the French Revolution*, Fling, 157.
- Sioussat, Mrs. Annie L., of hereditary patriotic socs. com. (1922), 19, 51, 89.
- Sioussat, St. George L., councillor A. H. A. (1922), 12, 17, 52, 82; of finance com. (1922), 17, 91, present at council meetings, 85, 87, 88.
- Sloane, William M., councillor A. H. A. (1922), 12, 17.
- Smith, Edwin, medical papyrus, 35.
- Smith, Justin H., chairman hist. mss. com. (1922), 18, 50, 89; of publications com. (1922), 18, 50, 89; report of hist. mss. com. (1921), 73.
- Smith, Theodore C., *Light on the Period from the Garfield Papers*, 39, (abstract) 194.
- Smoot, Sen., resolutions on natl. archives bldg. sent to, 110.
- Social studies. See National Council of Teachers of Social Studies.
- Sociology, Significance for Economic and Social History*, Barnes, 35-36; *Relation to Social and Economic History* (abstract), Barnes, 132-137.
- Soil Factor in Pa. and Va. Colonization*, Hulbert, 40, (abstract) 224-225.
- South, Fields for Research after Reconstruction* (abstract), Lonn, 197-198.
- South America, its History and its Historians*, Martin, 100-101.
- South Carolina, withdrawal of Federal troops, 193.
- Spain, Policy toward Her Revolted Colonies in 1823-1824* (abstract), Robertson, 35, 174.
- Spanish-American war, muster rolls, 113.
- Spanish colonial hist. teaching, 179.
- Spaulding, Oliver L., jr., of natl. archives com. (1922), 19, 51, 89; of military hist. com. (1922), 19, 51, 89; report of military hist. com. (1921), 69-71, 88; of div. of hist., University Center for Research, in Washington, 78, 80; of bd. of research advisers, Univ. Center for Research in Washington, 80.
- Staff, *Madame de*, 37.
- Standard Oil Co., 193.
- Steiner, Bernard C., of Justin Winsor prize com. (1922), 18, 50, 89.
- Stetson, John B., jr., chairman hist. congress at Rio de Janeiro spec. com. (1922), 20, 51, 90.
- Stevens, Wayne E., *Critical Problems Involved in the Use of the Official Records of the World War*, 34, (abstract), 206-209.
- Stewart, Ethelbert, of bd. of research advisers, Univ. Center for Research in Washington, 80.
- Stiles, C. C., paper discussed, 33; present at conf. of hist. socs. (1921), 111; *Lessons from Iowa*, 121
- Stinnes, Hugo, powerful, 127
- Strong, Moses A., papers, 114
- Studies in European history, board of editors (1922), 20, 91; project for, 85; report of spec. com. on publishing (1921), 87
- Study of English Legal History*, Crawford, 34, 155.
- Sully collection, 114
- Sullivan, James, of service com. (1922), 19, 51, 90; present at conf. of hist. socs. (1921), 111.
- Surrey, F. M., present at conf. of hist. soc. (1921), 111.
- Surrey, Mrs. N. M. Miller, *Growth of Industries in Louisiana, 1699-1763*, 42, 199; present at conf. of hist. socs. (1921), 111; French mss. in Library of Congress, 179.
- Survey of libraries for hist. collections, 67-69.
- Sutherland, George, of bd. of research advisers, Univ. Center for Research in Washington, 80.
- Sweet, William W., of hist. research in colleges com. (1922), 20, 51, 90.
- Swift, Eben, chairman military hist. com. (1922), 19, 51, 69, 89; *Development of the Art of War*, 35; (abstract) 233-236; *Two Brigades*, 70.
- Taikwa Reform in Japan*, Warner, 35, 169.
- Taliaferro collection, 114.
- Taylor, Henry C., of bd. of research advisers, Univ. Center for Research in Washington, 80.
- Telle de Sandoval, Francisco, papers, 172.
- Territorial govt. record, 112-113.
- Texas, cooperative marketing, 222.
- Thayer, William R., councillor A. H. A. (1922), 12, 17.

- Thirty-fifth Division on Sept. 29, 1918*, Lanza, 38, (abstract) 214-216.
- Thomas, Jesse B., author of *Mo. Compromise*, 187.
- Thomas, Shipley, study of Great War, 34; *Contribution to the Hist. of the World War of a Group of Officers of the A. E. F.* (abstract), 210-211
- Thompson, C. Mildred, of Justin Winsor prize com. (1922), 18, 50, 89.
- Thompson, James W., of board of editors, *Studies in European hist.* (1922), 20, 91.
- Thorndike, Lynn, *Guido Bonatti, an Astrologer of the Thirteenth Century Mentioned by Dante*, 36, (abstract) 147-148.
- Thruston, R. C. Ballard, of hereditary patriotic socs. com. (1922), 19, 51, 89; present at conf. of hist. socs. (1921), 111; discussion, 116-117.
- Thüman, —, central city, 131.
- Tiberius Caesar, 99.
- Tirhaka, King, 230.
- Tobien, Alexander von, collection of Latvian mss., 97.
- Todd, Isaac, agent of North West Co., 201.
- Town Privileges under the Establishments of Rouen*, Dow, 36-37, (abstract) 156.
- Traditions Concerning the Missouri Questions*, Shoemaker, 41, (abstract) 186-188.
- Transcripts from foreign archives, A. H. A. com. See Obtaining transcripts from foreign archives, A. H. A. com.
- Traveling expenses, 53, 87.
- Treat, Payson J., pres. P. C. B. (1922), 13, 103.
- Trenholme, Prof., discussion of hist. teaching, 124.
- Truce of God, 149-150.
- Tryon, Rolla M., paper, 31; *Desirable Adjustments between History and the Other Social Sciences*, (abstract) 121; discussion of hist. teaching, 124.
- Turner, Frederick J., counselor A. H. A. (1922), 12, 17.
- Tuttle, Julius H., of bibliog. of hist. socs. com. (1922), 18, (1921), 64.
- Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries in the History of Culture*, Paetow, 36, (abstract) 151-152.
- Two Brigades*, Swift, 70.
- Tyler, Mason W., of George L. Beer prize com. (1922), 20, 51, 90.
- Underwood, Sen., resolutions on natl. archives bldg. sent to, 110.
- U. S. Adjutant-General's Office, archives in, 112.
- U. S. Bureau of Census, data, 113.
- U. S. Bureau of Indian Affairs, archives, 116.
- U. S., classification of history, 69.
- U. S. Dept. of Commerce, census data, 113.
- U. S. Dept. of Justice, source material, 113.
- U. S. Dept. of State, Territorial govt. records, 112.
- U. S. General Land Office, records, 113.
- U. S. Indian Office, correspondence in, 112.
- U. S. Inspector Generals' Office, reports in, 112.
- U. S. Library of Congress, newspapers and MSS., 113; French MSS., 179.
- U. S. Post Office Dept., source material, 113.
- U. S. Post Offices and Post Roads Coms., files, 113.
- U. S. Treasury Dept., source material, 113.
- U. S. War Dept., muster rolls, 113.
- U. S. Weather Bureau, records in, 112.
- University Center for Research in Washington, articles of organization, etc., 78-82.
- division of history, 77.
- University center in Washington, A. H. A. com. on (1922), 20, 91; A. H. A. spec. com. on (1921), discharged, 60; final report (1921), 74-82, 85, 87.
- University center in Washington, Am. Political Science Assn. com. on (1921), 75.
- University Club, St. Louis, vote of thanks to, 88.
- Use of the Newspaper and Periodical Sources* (abstract), Cole, 195.
- Usher, A. P., metropolitan market, 131.
- Van Buren, Martin, Autobiography*, 62.
- Van Dyke, Paul, of Brussels hist. cong. com. (1922), 21, 91.
- Van Nostrand, J. J., jr., of membership com. (1922), 18, 51, 89.
- Van Tyne, Claude H., *American Revolution Viewed in the Light of the Last Two Decades of Research*, 38, (abstract), 180-181
- Venice, Italy, 129.
- Vergennes's *Nouvelles d'Angleterre et d'Amérique*, 37.
- Vestal, Samuel C., *Doctrine of Mutual Aid*, 70.
- Viceroyalty in the New World*, Aiton, 34, (abstract), 172-173.
- Violette, Eugene M., of hist. teaching in the schools com. (1922), 20, 51, 90; paper on adjustments in curriculum, 31; *Desirable Adjustments Between History and the Other Social Sciences* (abstract), 121-122.
- Virginia, *Soil Factor in Colonization*, Hulbert, 40, (abstract) 224-225.
- Voltaire's Philosophy of History*, Guérard, 37, (abstract), 157.
- Wadsworth, Eliot, of bd. of research advisers, Univ. Center for Research in Washington, 80.
- Walcott, Charles D., letter of submittal to Cong., 3.
- Walker, Francis, of Univ. Center for Research in Washington, 79, 80; of bd. of research advisers, Univ. Center for Research in Washington, 80.
- Walker, Williston, of board of editors, *Am. Hist. Rev.* (1922), 18.
- Walpole, Sir Robert, Electioneering in the Time of*, Perkins, 34, 155.
- Walsh, James J., pres. Amer. Catholic Hist. Assn. (1921), 30.
- War, Development of Art of*, Swift, 35, (abstract) 233-236.
- War of 1812, muster rolls, 113.
- War with Mexico, muster rolls, 113.
- Warner, Langdon, *Prince Shotoku and the Taikwa Reform in Japan*, 35, 169.
- Washington, Patty W., asst. sec.-treas. A. H. A. (1922), 16.
- Washington, D. C., metropolitan rivalry, 130.
- Washington, Material in, of Value to the States*, Moreness, 109, (abstract), 112-113.
- Washington University, luncheon, 30; A. H. A. vote of thanks to, 52, 88.
- Wells, H. G., *Outline of History*, 232.
- Wertenbaker, T. J., vote of thanks to, 85.
- Westermann, William L., of nominations com. (1922), 17, 44, 52, 82; of board of editors, *Hist. Outlook* (1922), 19, 51, 90; *Commerce and Economics*, 35, (abstract), 237.
- What Happens in Battle*, Groely, 70.
- White, Elijah, Indian school doctor, 102.
- White, Melvin J., *Influence of Agric. Conditions upon Louisiana State Politics During the Nineties*, 41, (abstract), 222.

- Wilhelm II, Kaiser of Germany, 212-213.
- Willard, James F., discussion of study of administrative hist. of England, 152.
- Willoughby, W. F., of Am. Political Science Assn. com. on university center in Washington (1921), 75; of Univ. Center for Research in Washington, 79, 80; of bd. of research advisers, Univ. Center for Research in Washington, 80.
- Wilson, Woodrow, 2d vice pres. A. H. A. (1922), 11, 16, 44, 52, 82; of agenda com. (1922), 17, 91.
- Winckler, —, discovery of Hittite documents, 230.
- Winston, James E., of membership com. (1922), 18, 51, 89.
- Wisconsin Domesday Book in Agricultural History*, Schafer, 40, (abstract), 220-221.
- Wisconsin Historical Soc., 114.
- Wise, Jennings C., of military hist. com. (1922), 19, 51, 89; *Am. Indian in the World War*, 70.
- Woodman, Cyrus, papers, 114.
- World War, luncheon conference on hist. of (1921), 34; *Causes of the*, Howland, 38, 212-213; *Critical Problems Involved in the Use of the Official Records of*, Stevens, 34, (abstract), 206-209; *Contribution to the Hist. of the World War of a Group of Officers of the A. E. F.* (abstract), Thomas, 210-211.
- Writing of history, A. H. A. spec. com. (1922), 21, 51, 90; continued, 84.
- Writings on American History*, Griffin, 62.
- Yale University, invitation to A. H. A., 60, 84.
- Yela, D. Francisco, MSS. hist. of Spain, 83.
- Young, Levi E., *Settlement of the Great Basin by the Mormon People*, 100.
- Zook, George F., sec. div. of hist., University Center for Research in Washington, 77, 79, 80; of bd. of research advisers, Univ. Center for Research in Washington, 80.











UNIVERSAL  
LIBRARY



122 200

UNIVERSAL  
LIBRARY